THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Loisy again! We cannot but admire the pertinacity of Dr. L. P. Jacks, whom we salute on the eve of his ninetieth birthday this month, in following up his translation of Loisy's 'La Naissance du Christianisme,' issued here in 1948, by a translation of Loisy's further volume, *Les Origines du Nouveau Testament*. The book is published under the title *The Origins of the New Testament*.[1] Much attention was paid to the translation of the former volume when it appeared, and Dr. Jacks has seen fit to translate the companion volume, which Loisy himself describes as a 'modest essay' complementary to the previous volume. 'We propose to resume the examination, as a whole and with greater precision in detail, of documents born in a realm almost outside that of history and written without any care for historical truth as it is now understood.' It should be said that these two books by Loisy were published in 1933 and 1936.

Loisy made such a brave stand for intellectual freedom within the Roman Catholic Church that we cannot but admire him. His New Testament criticism, however, is in many ways so extreme, although it is fortified by immense learning, that it may well be doubted whether these translations by Dr. Jacks have been worth while. Of course it is Dr. Jacks' contention that the importance of Loisy has been ignored by British New Testament scholars, but it is fair to retort that Loisy's views have not gained support, save perhaps, in some aspects of them, by the Bishop of Birmingham, amongst those best qualified to judge. When Loisy's 'Birth of the Christian Religion' was published two years ago, scholars like W. R. Matthews, T. W. Manson, H. G. Wood, and Sir Frederick Kenyon had little difficulty in showing that Loisy left greater problems to solve than those with which he imagined he was dealing. Particularly forthright in his criticism of Loisy for many years now has been Principal Vincent Taylor, who almost seems to revel in the prospect of being able to come to close grips with Loisy, and hails each new translation as it comes along with feelings of considerable zest. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should be among the first to deal, and to deal trenchantly at that, with this latest volume. In an article in 'The Hibbert Journal' for July 1950 he resumes the attacks that he has made on Loisy's teaching on various occasions in the same journal. It must be set down greatly to Dr. Jacks' credit that he has never failed to give full scope to reasoned criticisms of Loisy however destructive they appear to be, in spite of his own conviction, which, surprisingly, Gilbert Murray seems to share, that Loisy had at long last solved all the problems concerned with the beginnings of the Christian religion and the documents on which it is based. The present Editor of 'The Hibbert Journal' invited Dr. Vincent Taylor to review this new translation by Dr. Jacks, and the review appears almost as soon as the book itself.

Amongst all our New Testament scholars Dr. Taylor displays a degree of militancy in the defence of the Faith that makes him a sheer joy to read. This article is no exception, and should not be ignored by those who are desirous of coming to grips with the main questions that Loisy raises, and with the full Christian answer to them. In brief summary he states the views which Loisy holds and, with what we can only call a most refreshing pungency, he addresses himself to their demolition. Demolition is the word, because there is very little to be said in defence of Loisy after Dr. Taylor, writing with what we may declare to be the solid backing of the whole body of accredited British New Testament scholarship, has subjected him to a concentrated and devastating fire. It might be said that this is one of the most important articles which 'The Hibbert Journal' has published for a long time.

Strangely enough Loisy concludes his argument by expressing the view that 'that which happened in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, and in the first hundred and fifty obscure and tumultuous years of Christian history, will be matter of consequence to the human race to the last day of its existence on earth, because, while man lives not only upon bread, neither does he live only on science. Before all else he lives on the dynamism of the spirit, on the moral electricity of devoted love. Therein lies the true fulfilment of his

[1] Allen and Unwin; 18s. net.

destiny. Little does the bare letter matter of what Jesus, Peter, Paul, or John, and their interpreters, have had to say on that topic. What matters is the fire they kindled, and it is a fire that will never die till mankind is no more.' It is not difficult for Dr. Taylor or anyone else to point out that the fire kindled by the Jesus of Loisy would have been extinguished long ago.

Loisy's thesis is the view that the Gospels and Epistles are the reflection and the product of a threefold process. First there is the 'Catechesis' or teaching which consisted in the belief of Jesus that the Reign of God was imminent. This was an illusion, according to Loisy, which was widely shared by His countrymen and in His time. The dominating belief was that Jesus was about to bring in the Great Kingdom, and that men must prepare for the Divine Event by repentance and the acceptance of baptism. At the second stage teachings of the Risen Christ, received in vision, were added, and in the third stage the 'Catechesis' is transformed into the Gospel Legend, which is a tissue of later invention. Loisy, says Dr. Taylor, systematically works through each of the Gospels, laying his finger upon the fabrications and exposing them to view. Dr. Taylor himself takes his treatment of Mark's Gospel as an example, and subjects it to extremely damaging criticism, if indeed criticism be the word when Loisy puts forward so many statements of his own which are merely assertions without a shred of evidence. For example, the account of Peter's Confession, according to Loisy, is 'a sure sign that material of post-resurrection origin is being thrown back into the record of Jesus' ministry on earth.' Judas could not have been one of the Twelve. 'Even the story of the Denial has been invented at all points.' These are typical examples and, as Dr. Taylor emphasizes, there is no argument; there are merely assertions.

While Dr. Taylor feels that a mere statement of Loisy's views seems to contain its own refutation, he selects four points at which he is concerned to be extremely faithful in his criticism. Two of these we shall mention. The first of them is crucial. It is Loisy's view that the Gospel Story appears in a second century rather than a first century perspective. He considers that the Synoptic Gospels belong to the first third of the second century, while John's Gospel reached its present form towards 150–160. Dr. Taylor has little difficulty in showing that these conclusions are against all the findings of responsible New Testament scholarship of to-day, and that in addition a great deal of the evidence of tradition concerning the Gospels is quite imperfectly set down. So far as John's Gospel is concerned, Dr. Taylor remarks that the whole history of radical criticism is the story of a continual retreat in which Loisy appears as a straggler. Here he emphasizes again, as Sir Frederick Kenyon does, the importance amongst other evidence of the Papyrus now housed in the John Rylands Library. So far as Mark is concerned, 'the tendency of modern critical research is against hypotheses which isolate later elements added in the second century and tends more and more to account for sections which might appear to be insertions by the conditions which obtained in the *pre-Gospel* period.'

The second contention of Loisy with which he deals is that in the past sufficient attention has not been given to the effect on the Gospel tradition of Catechetical and Liturgical interests. To this Dr. Taylor replies that Form Criticism comes to our aid by showing these influences to have been at work in the pre-Gospel period rather than in any re-editing in the second century. Moreover, he declares, the antithesis 'not historical, but catechetical' is false. 'Why should the earliest teachers have fed catechumens on illusions rather than facts? And were the earliest eye-witnesses straightway wafted away into Heaven? Can the Jerusalem Church be entirely ignored in the dissemination of early tradition?' It will be seen at this point how Dr. Taylor turns Loisy's own guns upon himself. 'The violent denials of historical elements in the Gospels, which Loisy is compelled to endorse, are the most spectacular signs of the fragility of his hypothesis.' 'A hypothesis is strained indeed if its price is the belief that the first Christians invented the story of Judas, imagined the incident of the Denial, and devised the saying "Why callest thou Me good?" as a mystic subtilty rather than a living trait.'

We leave the study of Loisy's theories and of Dr. Taylor's reply in the name of sound New Testament scholarship with a strengthened feeling that our New Testament writings still stand inviolate. If this is the best that a destructive criticism has to offer concerning the foundation truths of the Christian Faith, then we shall take our stand on behalf of the full Christian position with an increased degree of assurance. Perhaps, after all, Dr. JACKS has done us, by translating Loisy, a greater service than he realized.

The Rev. J. Alexander FINDLAY, M.A., D.D., has published his Fernley-Hartley Lecture under the title *Jesus and His Parables*.[1] The treatment

[1] Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net.

of the subject is so fresh that the author need hardly have sought to justify his choice of it, on the ground that 'the time has come for a recall to the authentic Christian humanism with which the Synoptic Gospels are brimming over.' No doubt the recent theological movement tends to make us think of the Divine rather than the human element in Christianity, but there is always room for a new study of the teaching of Jesus in its humanistic aspects.

Our readers may be interested in an account of the line of treatment here followed. First comes a discussion of what constitutes a parable, and the suggestion is made that the essence of the parable, whether it takes the form of a 'pronouncement'—as the form-critics phrase it—or a narrative, is the element of surprise. 'When the tired slave waits upon his master we are concerned with the natural order of things; when the master waits upon the slave we are, on the other hand, in the realm of grace.'

In later chapters it is further suggested that the element of risk is native to the parable-story, side by side with that of surprise. This is why, for instance, the story of 'The Lost Sheep' is called a parable, and that of 'The Lost Coin' is not; why the story of 'The Unjust Judge and the Importunate Widow' is a parable and that of 'The Friend at Midnight' is not.

A discussion of parabolic sayings comes in the second chapter. One such saying is, 'Every one who exalts himself shall be humbled, and he who humbles himself shall be exalted.' Then we turn from parabolic sayings to parables which contain narrative, dealing first with those concerned chiefly with the surprising things to be seen in God's handiwork in Nature. Obvious examples are the Parables of the Sower, the Seed growing Secretly, the Mustard Seed, and the Leaven.

Then we pass from parables of Nature to those concerned chiefly with human life and endeavour. Here is an abundance of material, and an order of treatment is desirable. First are taken those narratives which Luke calls 'parables,' such as the Lost Sheep (but not the Lost Coin), the Rich Fool, the Unjust Judge and the Importunate Widow (but not the Friend at Midnight), the Wicked Husbandmen. The Pharisee and the Publican is considered later, as the word 'parable' here is textually questionable.

Then are taken the narratives in Matthew which begin with some such phrase as 'the kingdom of heaven is likened to' (the Matthean equivalent of 'Another parable He put before them'). The texts discussed here are the twin parables of the Hidden Treasure and the Pearl of Great Price, the Unmerciful Slave, the Labourers in the Vineyard, the Two Sons, the Man without the Wedding-garment, and the Talents.

After that are brought together those longer stories in Luke not called 'parables' (some of which show many of the characteristics of the authentic Gospel-parable, the elements of risk and surprise being very much to the fore in them). They are the Creditor and his Two Debtors, the Good Samaritan, the Importunate Neighbour, the Rich Man's Supper, the Woman and her Lost Coin, the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward, the Rich Man and Lazarus, and the Pharisee and the Publican.

Now comes a collection of what may be called parabolic material; references to human life and behaviour introduced by such phrases as 'Is there a man among you?' or 'What man among you?' and so on. This material is 'the ore from which the finished products we have learnt to call "parables" were fashioned.' The most obvious of such cases comes at the end of the Sermon on the Mount in both Matthew and Luke. Here the differences between the two Gospels are specially interesting. 'In the First Gospel the "rivers" are said to have "come," whereas in the Third the "river broke upon" the house. In other words, in the former the "rivers" are not there at all till the day of reckoning, in the latter the "river" is flowing the whole year round, but breaks its banks under the pressure of the rainy season.'

Finally, there comes a discussion of two 'borderline' cases in Matthew along with related material found here and there in Luke; in these, by the introduction of subject-matter drawn from the heavenly world, either what starts as a parable ends in allegory, or the whole story is allegorical from beginning to end. The instances in point are the story of the Bridesmaids and that of the Trial of the Nations.

It is obvious that Dr. FINDLAY has covered a good deal of ground in his effort to elucidate the true meaning of the word 'parable' in the Gospels. In the course of his discussions he uses his own translations of the original. He also shows himself alive to critical questions. If his suggestions will not always command approval, they will be at least recognized as coming from an acute and well-furnished mind.

Not the least interesting part of the book is the last chapter in which some general conclusions are offered (though there is matter here that goes beyond the subject proper). As one might expect, there is a recurrence to the point that it is time the voice of a liberal humanitarianism were heard again in Christian theology. In this connexion Dr. FINDLAY declares that what the last hundred years have shown is that no man or group of men is fit to be trusted with absolute power over the lives of others, and that the sins usually called vices of ordinary people are hardly to be deemed responsible for the world-wide tragedies of recent times. This latter note he readily finds in the prophets and in Paul and John (in the First Epistle)—see Ro $3^{11ff.}$, 1 Jn 5^{19}—but it is significantly rare in the teaching of Jesus. It is not that Jesus denied universal sinfulness but that He 'did not take that line' in appealing to sinful men and women. 'Make yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness' is as much part of the Word of God as 'Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish.' Why is this so? Why are the parables of Jesus so little like our sermons or devotional manuals, with their obvious evangelical application and intent?

Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship.

Prophet and Priest in Israel.

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR N. W. PORTEOUS, D.D., UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

THE subject with which this paper deals is not only a living issue in Old Testament science but has an important bearing on the nature of the religious life and the way in which it is fostered. Certain of its aspects are highly technical and much of the evidence which has to be considered is obscure; what is ultimately involved, however, is a matter of concern to others besides specialists.

Perhaps the best introduction to the topic to be discussed will be to quote a few words of the late Dr. A. C. Welch which appear in his book *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel* [1936]. The Jew, he says,[1] 'thought seriously and reverently of the nature of his God, but he always conceived of the divine nature in terms of the divine purpose, as something which was not concerned with the world of ideas, but which passed over at once into the world of action. . . . Religion to him remained a way of life. For him right thoughts about God issued in conduct. . . . But right thoughts about God must, above all, translate themselves into the things men did at their sanctuaries in reverence to Him and with the purpose of maintaining their relation to Him.' From these words it will be at once evident that we have here a break, not only with undue preoccupation with religious ideas but, what is also important, with that almost exclusive emphasis on the ethical significance of the prophets which underestimated the necessity of the cultic side of Israel's life.

Welch starts his investigation from the undoubted fact that, when after the Exile the Jews were seeking to reconstitute their civil and religious life, they fell back on their cult, much of which, it is generally agreed, belonged to the old pre-exilic use and practice of the Temple. If it be the case that the prophetic movement had been in irreconcilable opposition to the cult, how are we to explain the remarkable circumstance that the men of the post-exilic period, recognizing, as they did, that the prophets' forecast of judgment to come had been justified by events, nevertheless in the time of reconstruction turned to the very thing which the prophets had so bitterly condemned, and the still more remarkable circumstance that this 'pagan' cult proved the means of preserving the uniqueness of the Jewish faith? Does this paradoxical state of affairs not suggest that there must be something wrong about the estimate of the post-exilic Hebrew cult as something essentially Canaanite in character? In his penetrating study Welch seeks to maintain that from the time of Moses onwards the religious guides and leaders of Israel were struggling to frame a cult which would be consistent with, and preservative of, that unique revelation which came with Moses, and that to this end they gradually modified both the pre-exilic Israelite cult and those elements of the Canaanite cults which they saw fit to borrow from their neighbours after the Conquest. That Israel should have a cult was quite essential. 'Men cannot live upon a memory,' declares Welch,[2] 'even on the memory of an act of God. Unless their relation to the God of their deliverance could be maintained by acts of faith, such as make up an acting religion, each successive generation would see the memory

[1] P. 70.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 46 f.

grow more dim.' But for the fact that there were those who realized the danger and took the necessary steps to meet it, ' the reform movement under Moses would have been reduced to a few theoretic propositions which were held *in vacuo*, but which had no direct influence on the rites the people performed in order to maintain their relation to their God. . . . Priest and prophet united to meet this danger.' [1]

The evidence for these statements Welch finds in, for example, the regulations for Passover which he regards as a palimpsest (Ex 12), in the rubric for the offering of First Fruits (Dt 26), in the passage about the bread of the Presence (Ex 25^{23-30}), in the ritual for the Day of Atonement (Lv 16) and in the gradual ' historification ' of the main annual festivals illustrated, for example, by Ps 81, which is a liturgy for use at the Feast of Tabernacles. Welch's contention is that over a very wide area there was co-operation between priest and prophet. The conflict between priests and prophets on the one hand and certain of the prophets—those whom Pedersen not too happily designates the ' reactionary ' prophets—on the other hand, arose at the point where a further step was necessary beyond the initial one of deciding that Israel should worship in this way and not in that way. The great prophets of Israel were men who transmitted, and themselves upheld, a religious tradition which went back to Moses, but who also ventured to criticise that tradition and plead for its reform. The plea which Welch makes is that we should remember the concern which these men cherished for the worship of their people and the extent to which they contributed to it, as well as the extent to which they felt themselves compelled in the name of God to condemn it. They were not opposing the ethical to the ritual ; they were asking for a ritual which should not be at variance with the ethical demands of Israel's God.

All this challenges us to look again at the Hebrew prophets and ask ourselves what kind of men they were. Now, the difficulty is that when we do pass behind the ethical judgments of the prophets, in which we feel them akin to ourselves and therefore reasonably easy to understand, to the religious practices of the ancient world to which they belonged, we begin to find them strangely alien and even unintelligible. They may lose much of their appeal to our modern minds. We study the evidence with scientific detachment and then we ask ourselves the question as to the relevance of all this to our present-day concerns. As Schweitzer said of the Jesus of History, the prophets seem to walk past us back to their own time and to become more or less inscrutable figures. This, however, is an ultimate question. The first task is to look at the evidence and see what has been made of it by the scholars who have subjected it to intensive research in these last years.

[1] *Op. cit.*, 145.

Just a month before Welch published the book to which reference has been made, the sixth article in a series entitled ' Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems' appeared in this magazine. Its author was A. R. Johnson, now Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages in University College, Cardiff, and the subject of his paper was ' The Prophet in Israelite Worship.' Johnson has since elaborated part of this original article in his important monograph *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* [1944]. In these studies reference was made to a number of scholars who had drawn attention to certain phenomena in the Old Testament which seemed to prove that the prophetic movement in general stood in a much closer relation to the Hebrew cult than had been commonly believed. In particular, acknowledgment was made of the epoch-making contribution of Sigmund Mowinckel of Oslo in his *Psalmenstudien*, iii. [1922–1923].

Mowinckel started from the insight of the German scholar Gunkel who had drawn attention to the prophetical elements in the Psalter without being able to supply a satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon. Gunkel's explanation was that the prophets had imitated the Psalm style, producing a mixed type of writing. The Psalmists had then followed suit and imitated this mixed prophetic style ! The suggestion is obviously a highly academic and artificial one and does not carry conviction. This is not the way in which things happen. The main thesis of Mowinckel's elaborate study is that the prophetic oracles in the Psalms betray the presence among the personnel of the Jerusalem sanctuary of so-called cultic prophets who played an active part in the liturgical services and to whom we probably have to look for the actual composition of many of the Psalms. The reason for the surprise which is commonly felt at the suggestion is that most people tend to concentrate attention on men like Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and suppose that, in spite of all the things they said about the cult of their time, they were actually having an influence from outside upon it sufficient to account for the prophetic elements which appear in the liturgies. All the other prophets, though actually forming the vast majority, are dismissed as ' false ' prophets and felt to be scarcely in the reckoning.

An important point made by Mowinckel is that the Hebrew cult has two sides to it. There was the sacrificial aspect on which we have tended to concentrate our attention. But there was also the sacramental side and this deserves the closest scrutiny. We do grave injustice to the Hebrew

cult if we suppose that it consisted entirely of things which men did in the service of God. Of equal importance was the dramatic representation within the cult of the things which God was believed to have done and to be doing for Israel. His will had to be proclaimed. His answers to prayer had to be communicated. His great deeds on behalf of His people in the past had to be recapitulated. Mowinckel's thesis is that in all this side of Israelite worship a leading part was taken by cultic prophets. Inasmuch as this cultic rôle was an essential and indispensable one in the system of Israel's worship, we must in consequence think of these prophets as regular officials in the sanctuary no less than the priests. We are to think of them as present as a matter of course at public acts of worship, performing those exercises by which the prophetic state was induced and playing their part along with the priests in cultic events which were more than religious drama,[1] consisting of religious symbolism believed within the pattern of ancient thought to have a magical effect on the course of Nature and history. In agreement with this view of Mowinckel's, Hubert Junker in his book *Prophet und Seher in Israel* [1927] argues that it is to the prophets that we owe the cultivation of religious poetry in Israel and that we are to think of cult prophets as contributing actively to the worship of the sanctuaries, which had as regular features dancing, instrumental playing and the singing of religious songs.[2] Junker disposed effectively of König's suggestion[3] that the *bene-hannebhi'im* were only secondary prophets, attendants on, and imitators of, the great prophets, arguing rather that they were prophets in their own right, connected with the cult. They may, of course, at times have been brought into relations with the greater religious personalities and may even have supported them.[4]

Mowinckel raises a very important point in connexion with his theory that there is a prophetic sacramental element in many of the psalm liturgies implying the participation in the worship of cult prophets. It may be objected, he says, that his supposition is a kind of profanation of the Psalms, inasmuch as the essence of genuine prophecy is spontaneity and on his view prophecy would be reduced to the repetition of liturgical forms. Mowinckel's answer is that the prophecies which appear in the liturgies may well have originally been spontaneous outpourings of some prophet and that their repetition in no way detracts from their value and certainly need not be regarded as hypocritical, any more than a similar charge can properly be brought against a preacher in a Christian church to-day, who takes one of the great utterances of our Lord about forgiveness and applies it to his hearers.[5] It is, of course, possible that an element of spontaneity may actually have been preserved both as regards content and form. It is not unlikely, moreover, that the pronouncing of the Divine oracle may have been connected with some method of taking the omens or obtaining a sign.[6] That there is a ' prophetic ' element in the Psalms has, of course, long been recognized. Mowinckel's discovery is that to this prophetic element there must have corresponded in the actual worship, for which so many of the Psalms provide the liturgies, a cultic reality. The question at issue is whether Mowinckel and those who follow him are right in supposing that this cultic reality implies the presence at the sanctuaries, as permanent members of the cultic staff, of groups of prophets distinct from the priests.

The fullest treatment of the question at issue in this country is to be found in the writings already referred to of A. R. Johnson, from whose pen we may expect a further treatment of the work of the cultic prophets as he envisages it in a pamphlet with the title *The Cultic Prophet and the Psalter.* Johnson surveys the Biblical evidence which seems to point to the close association of groups of prophets with the cult centres in Israel. Much of this evidence is comparatively familiar and it is unnecessary to recapitulate it fully here. Some indication of its nature, however, may be found convenient. It comes from all the main periods of prophetic activity. In the period of the rise of the monarchy we read in the stories about Samuel and Saul of bands of enthusiasts, in one of the two cases the band being encountered when on its way down from a sanctuary.[7] Incidentally, as Junker has pointed out,[8] there is no evidence that these bands wandered about the countryside like wild dervishes. They seem rather to have lived together in settlements (*newajoth*),[9] and these may normally have been in the neighbourhood of sanctuaries. Certainly Samuel, who stood in some kind of relation to the prophetic settlement at Ramah, had himself become a *nābhī* while serving at the sanctuary at Shiloh. There is also sporadic evidence for the existence of individual prophets at the royal court both at Jerusalem under the united monarchy and later after the kingdom divided. To give only one example, Nathan, whom at the end of David's reign we find associated with the priest Zadok in the intrigue which led to the accession of Solomon,[10]

[1] Cf. A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, 38–40.

[2] *Prophet und Seher in Israel*, 14–35.

[3] *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, § 16d (p. 62 f.).

[4] Junker, *op. cit.*, 26 f.

[5] *Psalmenstudien*, iii. 8 f.

[6] See, for example, Ps 86^{17}.

[7] 1 S $10^{5ff.}$

[8] *Op. cit.*, 31 ff.

[9] 1 S 19^{18-24}.

[10] 1 K 1.

appears earlier as the adviser of David in the cultic matter of building a temple.[1] Further evidence of the connexion of prophets with the sanctuaries comes from the story of Elijah[2] and from the fact that Jehu gathered together Baal prophets as well as priests to an imaginary sacrifice in the house of Baal,[3] the inference being that Yahweh worship must have been organized on similar lines. Later still in the works of canonical prophets like Micah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel we find references to the prophets, who are criticized, not for giving oracles when consulted—that was their proper function—but for giving false oracles.[4] Like the priests the prophets seem to have an official standing. Whether that inevitably points to their being actually cult officials is not so clear. It is true, of course, that there are places in Scripture where prophets and priests are coupled together in connexion with the Temple at Jerusalem.[5]

Perhaps the most interesting evidence comes from the Books of Chronicles in which we find that the leaders of the Temple choirs, Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman are described as King's 'seers' and the choirs under their conductorship are spoken of as 'prophesying.' In 2 Ch 20^{1-30} 'the Chronicler actually gives a picture of a Temple prophet in the performance of his duty at a critical period in the reign of Jehoshaphat; but, in accordance with his point of view he represents the prophet in question as a member, not of a prophetic guild, but of a Temple choir—that of the "sons" of Asaph.'[6] A comparison of 2 K 23^{2} with its parallel 2 Ch 34^{30} shows the Chronicler deliberately altering the word 'prophets' in his source into 'Levites.' The inference which is drawn is that in the post-exilic Temple cult the functions of the pre-exilic cult prophets were taken over by the Temple choirs which were legitimized by being regarded as consisting of Levites.

Speaking generally, it may be admitted that an impressive case has been made out for the existence in Israel of cult prophets forming a regular part of the personnel of the sanctuaries. The evidence is perhaps less convincing in the case of Northern Israel than it is in the case of Jerusalem. The vivid stories associated with the name of Elisha, for example, apart from the fact that he seems to have lived sometimes at Mount Carmel and that the usual day for visiting him was the day of the new moon or the Sabbath, are characterized by an absence of cultic colouring, though it is true that, as Johnson has pointed out,[7] the accession of Jehu, instigated by Elisha, was followed by the sweeping away of the baalized cult of the Northern Kingdom. In this whole matter a very salutary word of caution has been spoken by H. H. Rowley,[8] who points out that the association of groups of prophets with certain of the shrines and even the occasional evidence that outstanding prophetic individuals like Samuel actually functioned at shrines by no means prove that they belonged to the cultic staff. 'We must beware,' he writes, 'of outrunning the evidence, or of supposing that a theory of cultic prophets is more than a theory.'[9]

During the period with which we are concerned the discussion regarding the relation of prophets to cultic activities had never been entirely confined to Israel. With the publication in 1945 of Alfred Haldar's book, *Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites*, however, the field of investigation was greatly extended. A study of the evidence about guilds of priests and diviners in the Mesopotamian area in ancient times, in the West-Semitic area excluding Israel (Phœnician inscriptions and Ras Shamra texts) and in pre-Islamic Arabia, and a comparison of all this with the internal evidence of the Old Testament about conditions in Israel lead Haldar to the conclusion that the system over the whole area must have been remarkably uniform, if we allow for a certain variety due to the different levels of civilization in the several areas and the conditioning effect of different geographical environments. Everywhere in the Semitic world outside Israel we seem to find the closest integration of guilds of diviners into the cultic system. In the Mesopotamian area the two main types of divination, (*a*) by various 'technical oracle methods,' and (*b*) by oracles communicated in a state of 'ecstasy' are theoretically assigned to separate categories of cultic officials, the so-called *bārû* and *maḫḫû* priests. Haldar explains, however, that these classes seem to have overlapped, so that we find what he calls 'cumulation of functions.' 'The Accadian *bārû*

[1] 2 S 7. [2] 1 K 18, 19. [3] 2 K $10^{18ff.}$.
[4] Johnson, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvii. 315.
[5] Jer 23^{11}, La 2^{20}.
[6] Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, 61.
[7] Johnson, *op. cit.*, 28.

[8] 'The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study,' in *Harvard Theological Review*, xxxviii. 14–16. See also H. Wheeler Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, 222–25.

[9] It might, of course, be argued that, as the king is a sacral personality, then prophets attached to his court for purposes of consultation (1 K 22), or to his army (2 K $3^{11ff.}$), are cultic officials. This, however, would be to stretch the meaning of the word 'cult' unduly. The activity of Hananiah, described in Jer 28, takes place 'in the presence of the priests, and in the presence of all the people that stood in the house of the Lord.' What bearing have these words on the status of Hananiah? A great deal might go on in the temple besides the regular cultic acts. Jesus taught in the temple courts without being a cultic official.

priest can take part in the ecstatic rites and the *maḫḫū* priest busy himself with divination by the observation of omens.' He suggests that there might be a similar overlapping of functions in the West-Semitic area not excluding Israel.[1] The present writer feels inclined to press this point and ask whether the undoubted presence of prophetic elements in the Psalter, which has been so fully demonstrated by scholars like Mowinckel, Junker, and Johnson, necessarily implies that a distinct class of *nebhi'im* or prophets within the cult personnel, as distinguished from the *kohanim* or priests, need be postulated. May we not suppose that there was a cumulation of functions in the case of the priests, so that, to adopt Mowinckel's terminology, they were capable of carrying out both the sacrificial and the sacramental parts of the cult? Mowinckel points out[2] that the Old Testament draws a sharp distinction between priests and prophets, the former being charged with communicating the *tōrā* of God and operating through the cult, the latter, as recipients of free inspiration, being the mediators of the Divine *dabhar* or word. He suggests that, while the *nebhi'im* were undoubtedly associated with the sanctuary, it was only certain among them who were actually admitted to be cult functionaries, the great majority being representative of the congregation and performing the orgiastic exercises on its behalf. The prophets, therefore, are to be thought of as representatives of the lay element in the worship. Is it then really necessary to suppose that we have two classes of prophets associated with the sanctuaries, namely, a majority of lay prophets and a minority of cult prophets? May the supposed cult prophets not merely be priests who, like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, were specially endowed to undertake the sacramental side of worship, but, unlike them, did not feel forced into an attitude of criticism toward the cult? Haldar's principle of cumulation of functions might very well apply here.

There is finally the problem of the canonical prophets. To what extent are they to be regarded as connected with the cult? Haldar does all he can to suggest that as little distinction as possible should be drawn between the canonical prophets and the so-called cult prophets. Certainly there is a good deal of evidence to connect the former with the sanctuaries. Isaiah has his inaugural vision in the Temple: Jeremiah and Ezekiel are priests: certain of the prophetical books, like Joel, Nahum and Habakkuk, may have a liturgical origin, while liturgical elements or imitations of liturgies appear in other books still. But caution is necessary here. Certainly Haldar seems to be somewhat perverse in his attempt to prove that Amos belonged to the cult staff of the sanctuary at Teqoa'![3] He infers this from the facts that Amos is described[4] as 'among the herdmen (*nōqedhīm*) of Teqoa'' and describes himself as a herdman (*bōqēr*).[5] This is brought into relation to the fact that the leader of a guild of officials at Ugarit[6] is called *rb khnm rb nḳdm*, 'chief of the priests and chief of the shepherds.' He supposes that Amos must have been the watcher of a herd of sheep belonging to the priests of the sanctuary at Teqoa', the priesthood of which 'was probably some sort of a filial of the Jerusalemitic priesthood.'[7] The plain meaning of the statement of Amos, however, is against Haldar's supposition, and it is difficult to see why, because the word *nōqēdh* sometimes means 'keeper of the temple herd,' it should always bear that meaning. Mesha of Moab may have been a sacral king—indeed it is probable that he was—but, when he is described as a *nōqēdh*,[8] the word does not seem to have a sacral reference but to refer to the fact that Mesha controlled the big business of the country which happened to be sheep-farming.

Pedersen[9] believes that prophets were found in pre-exilic times as officials in the Temple at Jerusalem in some capacity and that their power was used by the king in the cult 'as a psychic foundation for the monarchy.' He points out, however, that in post-exilic times the prophets, like the king, had entirely disappeared from the ritual laws. But long before the Exile, beginning indeed in the ninth century B.C. during the reign of Ahab, a new type of 'reactionary' prophet began to make his appearance, not breaking completely with traditional prophetism, sharing the psychic experiences associated with it, but valuing them, not because they created holiness for the community, but because they authenticated to the prophet the genuineness of his inspiration.[10]

The prophets par excellence in Israel gradually dissociated themselves from the activities of their prophetic brethren who by their supposed psychic power were the spiritual supporters of the people and as such were in alliance with the priests. To recognize, however, that the great prophetic figures were in opposition to what the rulers, priests and *nebhi'im* stood for, that they were the

[1] Haldar, *Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites*, 199.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 16 f.

[3] *Op cit.*, 112. [4] Am 1[1]. [5] Am 7[14].

[6] See Haldar, *op. cit.*, 79 and references.

[7] *Ib.*, 112, note 4.

[8] 2 K 3[4]; cf. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*, 87 who argues also for a sacral meaning for *nōqēdh* in 2 K 3[4] where the word is applied to Mesha. Cf. *Moabite Stone*, l. 30.

[9] *Israel*, iii.–iv. 127.

[10] Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, 134 f.

watchmen of Israel to warn it of its approaching doom, that their rôle was primarily a critical one, does not imply that the whole cultic system of Israel was founded on a mistake. We may hold with Welch that from the outset of Israel's life as a people there was a prophetic activity going on inside the cult guarding it against the contamination of paganizing influences. At the same time we may recognize the danger which lies in any and every cult that it should become an *opus operatum*. Cult there must be if the true relation of God and man is to be maintained, but, if the cult is to serve that purpose, then it must itself remain under the judgment of God. To this double attitude toward the cult, which is so clearly documented in the Old Testament, corresponds the cleavage in the ranks of the prophets. Whether the prophetic guilds were guilds of cultic officials or not, they certainly were believed to support the body politic by their psychic power. That in a society with this intellectual outlook, which had so much in common with what prevailed elsewhere in the ancient world, an opposition should have developed at all is the abiding miracle of Israel. It is surely unlikely that a just appreciation of what happened in Israel and through Israel in the world will be reached if, like Haldar, we seek to level all the prophets down to what we know of the Mesopotamian associations of diviners and ecstatics, especially as our knowledge is most fragmentary in character and mingled with much that is speculative. Yet we may be grateful for the efforts he and others have made to show that the Hebrew prophets were not so isolated from the life of their people as has often been supposed, and that the men, whether prophets or not, who cared for the worship of their people, were in their own way serving the purpose of God.

Literature.

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

THERE are clear signs of a revival of interest in Old Testament Theology, as distinct from the History of Hebrew religion. The latter deals with Hebrew religion in its chronological sequence ; the former describes its persistent and distinctive principles in logical or 'theological' order. Eichrodt, whose three volumes on the Theology are so far outstanding, has described the difference between the two methods as that between a 'lengthwise section' and a 'cross section.' It is doing no despite to Eichrodt's great work to say that *the* Old Testament Theology of *this* century—and we cannot envisage what the needs of *next* century may be—still remains to be written ; at any rate, other works on the subject are in prospect.

The difficulties of such an undertaking are immense. This is evident from the fact that so many Old Testament Theologies during the past century were posthumously published, almost as though their authors had grown old and died in their attempts to write them. Anyone proposing such a venture will now have to take account—and he will be grateful for it—of a short essay in Prolegomena by Professor R. C. Dentan, of Berkeley Divinity School (New Haven), entitled *Preface to Old Testament Theology* (Yale University Press ; and Cumberlege ; 12s. 6d. net). The book contains seventy-five closely printed pages and is divided into two equal parts : (1) The History of Old Testament Theology as a Theological Discipline, (2) The Nature and Method of the Discipline. It is rather 'pemmican' reading—this in the nature of the case ; but it is wise and balanced. It is the kind of book which hardly lends itself to summarizing, and it must suffice to say that no aspect of the subject appears to have escaped the author's attention. Perhaps the best thing a reviewer who is rationed for space can do is to quote Dr. Dentan's final definition of Old Testament Theology : '. . . its scope should be, not the sum-total of religious phenomena in Israel, but rather the ideas and concepts of the normative or distinctive religion taught or assumed by the canonical books of the Old Testament, all of which have their center in a distinctive doctrine of God (theo-logy) ; that it should include broadly the subjects of ethics and cultus so far as these are expressions of distinctive religious ideas, but should specifically exclude mere antiquarian information about laws and religious customs ; that it should aim, not merely to give a description of the religious ideas of Israel, but to communicate in a vivid and moving way the piety which clothed those ideas with life and color. We should also add that its method is historical and critical, but like all other historical studies, demands sympathy, insight, and inner participation from the student, and that an invaluable precondition for such inner participation is that the student of Old Testament theology should in some sense share the Old Testament faith—to the extent that that faith continues to form a part of the Christian religious consciousness. Finally we should observe that it is the function of Old Testament theology to act

as the culminating discipline of the Old Testament sciences and to constitute a bridge over which the most significant conclusions of technical studies in Old Testament Introduction, History, and Exegesis pass to become useful materials for the biblical theology of the New Testament and for Historical, Systematic, and Practical Theology.'

This is excellent. May we hope that Professor Dentan will go on to give us such a Theology himself ?

C. R. NORTH.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS: PUBLISHED TEXTS.

In the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES I had occasion to refer to a recently published volume by the American Schools of Oriental Research which contains the text of the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary; it now falls to my lot to review this handsome and extremely important publication—*The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*: Volume I. *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, edited for the Trustees by Millar Burrows with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee (American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven; $5.00; in English currency; 40s. plus postage). In a Foreword to the book Mar Athanasius Samuel, the Syrian Archbishop and Head of the St. Mark's Monastery, and owner of the Scrolls, acknowledges indebtedness to the American Schools of Oriental Research for 'their guidance and skill in pursuing the intensive studies necessary to reveal the importance of this discovery, and for the investment of funds that has been necessary to bring the scrolls to publication.' We, too, may express gratitude to the ASOR for having proceeded so promptly and effectively, for the volume already in our hands at such a reasonable price leaves comparatively little to be desired.

The twenty-three pages of general introduction contain a brief recapitulation of the story of the discovery as retailed mainly by Mar Athanasius and Dr. Trever in 'The Biblical Archæologist' and 'The Bulletin of the ASOR,' and a fairly detailed description of the two Scrolls. The Isaiah Scroll, introduced by Dr. Trever, naturally takes pride of place, and descriptive details of size, measurements of columns, quality and state of the parchment, writing, reproduction of unidentified marginal symbols, and some notices of scribal errors are given. Similar incidental details about the Habakkuk Scroll are provided by Dr. Brownlee, together with a useful summary of the contents of the commentary. One misses from the general introduction, however, information which might be applicable to some relevant questions already raised, for instance, that by Professor G. R. Driver concerning an analysis of the ink used by the scribes—whether it was vegetable or mineral.

The *pièce de résistance* in the volume is, of course, the series of plates containing facsimiles of the Scrolls. Isaiah covers plates I–LIV, and they 'are as nearly the exact size of the original as photographic processes admit.' The plates are remarkably clear, and are blurred only where the MS. itself is badly worn. On the page facing each plate a transcription is printed, with Massoretic chapter and verse enumeration, and every fifth line of the plate is also indicated, rather inconveniently, on the margin of this same page. Plates LV–LXI give the Habakkuk commentary, with the opposite pages providing a Hebrew transcription, the Biblical text being in heavy print. There are no attempts to justify readings or tentative identifications in the latter, and doubtless some of the renderings will be challenged in the future.

Volumes 2 and 3 of the series are promised for the near future. The one is to contain the text of the 'Lamech Apocalypse' and the two MSS. which form the 'Sectarian Manual of Discipline'; the other will discuss some of the numerous problems which have already been shown to be controversial. Naturally the publications are eagerly awaited by Old Testament scholars, and the fact that the first-fruits are so delectable makes expectation still more exciting.

B. J. ROBERTS.

THE MAN FROM NAZARETH.

Does any one exercise a wider ministry than Dr. Fosdick ? Apart altogether from his services and sermons, his books are mounting up toward thirty, and one of them has had a circulation of over a million copies. Here comes another, adequately described by its title, *The Man from Nazareth as His Contemporaries Saw Him* (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net). It is a series of vivid and worthwhile studies of how our Lord appeared to various groups of those among whom He moved, and how they reacted to Him—the crowds, the scribes and Pharisees, the self-complacent, the outcasts, the women and children, the first disciples, the militant nationalists, and the Jews with a world-wide outlook. Needless to say, it is well done. Dr. Fosdick is an excellent teacher who grips and holds his reader's mind. Naturally, some chapters have more in them than others. And not everyone will agree with everything he says. When, for example, we are told that 'As for us moderns, Mahatma Gandhi should help us to understand Jesus. . . . Yet with indefatigable persistence he

held to his non-violent course, refusing military revolt and depending solely on the might and pressure of spiritual forces,' Dr. Fosdick has surely forgotten that one of Gandhi's most devoted admirers and for long a member of his household has told us that in the First World War Gandhi was so set upon volunteering for the Front that he had to be almost forcibly restrained. And there are other matters, nearer the heart of things, that some may want to question.

For my own part, I find it extraordinarily irritating when a reviewer, with a full and impressive book before him, fastens on some trivial mistake, so blurring the proportion of things. Yet when the next edition is issued something will have to be done about a sentence on p. 66. For, in the question of the Sadducees, it was not, of course, a man who had seven wives, but a woman who had seven husbands. That obviously is the veriest slip, and most uncharacteristic. For Dr. Fosdick's book is built up on sound knowledge—of the Scriptures, and of much other relevant literature. It is admirably written. And, as one would expect, is to be highly recommended.

A. J. Gossip.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO JULIAN.

From Constantine to Julian, by the late Hans Lietzmann, translated by Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf (Lutterworth Press ; 21s. net), is the third volume of Lietzmann's *A History of the Early Church.* Lietzmann died in 1942. Originally the work was projected in five volumes. It is good to know that Lietzmann's work on the fourth volume was so far advanced that it has already been possible to publish it in German and that an English translation is on the way. This is an extremely important book. It is not a book to put into the hands of any one who proposes to study the history of the period for the first time ; but for any one who already has a working knowledge of the period the book is a treasure-house.

There are most useful and comprehensive studies of Plotinus and Porphyry. There are penetrating and dramatic character studies of Constantine, Diocletian, and Julian. Julian, at least at first, was a man of the widest sympathies and the widest tolerance and had the intention of gathering into his government men from all parties, all philosophies, and all religions. ' We mix together, not with the polite hypocrisy with which you probably have been hitherto acquainted—in which a man speaks compliments to people whom he hates fiercely as his worst enemies—no ! we upbraid one another with all due freedom, when it is needed, and blame one another, and in doing so think no less of one another than of the best of friends.' What a motto and a policy for any committee or court of the Church ! ' The Christians are more dangerous enemies to one another than are wild beasts.' It is humiliating to hear a pagan Emperor administer a rebuke which is still valid. There is also a most excellent account of the pagan counterparts of the Christian Festivals.

Two men emerge rather surprisingly in this book. Eusebius emerges as an historian of standing and of authority. Athanasius emerges as certainly a great man but equally certainly a not very attractive figure. Lietzmann calls him at different times ' the self-confident pope of Egypt,' ' the energetic pope . . . and the pugnacious bishop,' ' an unbendable politician.' On the whole Athanasius emerges as a very great and a very strong man but scarcely as the pure-minded defender of the Christian Faith.

This book is written with all Lietzmann's mastery of his material, his lucidity of arrangement, and his sense of the dramatic in history. One of the most notable things about it is that Lietzmann never makes a statement without, in a footnote, giving his authority for it. The footnotes themselves are therefore a mine of information for any one who wishes to carry out independent research.

The translation is well done. On p. 103 Meletius appears as Miletius ; Filocalus appears on p. 238 and Philocalus on p. 240. The book is helpfully indexed and the summaries of the chapters in the table of contents greatly enhance the usefulness of the book. There is a select bibliography compiled by the Rev. H. Chadwick, M.A., which might with profit have been far fuller than it is.

William Barclay.

THE NEW MAN.

The author of *The New Man : An Interpretation of Some Parables and Miracles of Christ* (Stuart and Richards ; 15s. net), Mr. Maurice Nicoll, M.B., B.C., B.A., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., son of the late Sir William Robertson Nicoll, might be described as a theosophical Christian. It is not clear whether his debt to theosophy is conscious or unconscious, but the similarity between his teaching and that of many belonging to this School of religious thought is very striking. One almost regrets that Dr. Nicoll is not a member of the Indian Christian Community, because he could have rendered inestimable service in helping the Christian Church in India to conserve the truths of their philosophical inheritance—which many are trying to do—and to enrich Christian theology by means of them. Whether this prominent medical psychologist would have guarded equally well against the dangers inherent in theosophy and in

a too facile eclecticism is less certain. He comes uncomfortably close to the ancient Indian doctrine of the ' two orders of knowledge,' and also to the theosophical belief in an ancient mystical body of knowledge, preserved by adepts throughout the ages and accessible only to chosen disciples—an unproved theory which plays a great part in theosophical speculation.

The central purpose of the book is indicated by the title, *The New Man*, and the author stresses very beautifully and impressively the idea that the intention of Christ is to draw His disciples aside from the external world of circumstances and rewards to an inner development of the consciousness of a new and higher life, to a participation by ' faith ' in a new birth, through a power sent down from a higher level and mediated by Christ. The whole intention of His parables and miracles is to reveal symbolically this higher and inward life. The book is anti-humanistic in its argument that man cannot rely on his own powers, but, at the same time, it repeatedly calls for self-determination, interpreting the self very much in the sense of the Eastern Vedānta philosophy.

The author's conception of parable is not without its dangers, in that he thinks that the ' spiritual meaning ' is totally beyond the ' literal meaning.' This attitude allows too much room for fantastic allegory. While no doubt Christ spoke in parables which were intentionally symbolic, we think that His aim was, not to conceal truth from those who were not yet able to bear it (a pedagogical and theosophic idea) but rather to turn men away from generalizations and arid speculations, and encourage them to find their religion, as Oman puts it in a similar connexion, ' in the midst of life's daily tasks and trials,' to assure them that there they would find life and communion with God or not at all.

Dr. Nicoll is interested in numerology, so much so that he might be said to belong to the class of those who ' lisp'd in numbers for the numbers came '—came rather too frequently in this book. We are not convinced by the alleged significance of ' three ' as equivalent to the beginning, the middle, and the end, or of the ' five ' porches as indicating the senses. But this tendency is incidental and not central in the book, and many of his interpretations, though startling, are suggestive and illuminating. In several instances they have stimulated the present reviewer to a fresh reference to textual authorities, and in almost every case the suggestions have been found to be fully justified. The book is rather unequal in the appeal of its different parts. The chapter on ' The Idea of Righteousness in the Gospels ' is wholly admirable, but we wish that the concluding chapter on Judas Iscariot had been omitted. In it the author attempts to rehabilitate the character of Judas by representing him as carrying out an explicit intention of Jesus, and passively accepting the rôle of symbolizing the extreme power of evil, thus suggesting, rather unfortunately, that Jesus was staging a cosmic drama and overwhelming the personalities of His disciples so that they might play appropriate parts. We wish that, in place of this chapter, Dr. Nicoll had developed further his central theme, and shown more clearly how the transition from the lower to the higher sphere can be effected. He traces negatively the process whereby the disciples were gradually weaned from a dependence on the personal and literal presence of Christ, but we feel that so much is given us in this book which is of value and inspiring that we might very well have looked to the author for guidance towards a more positive understanding of how spiritual development is dependent on the continuing revelational power of the Risen Christ. We have gained so much from this book that we wish for more—slightly different, indeed, but inspired by the same spirit.

W. S. URQUHART.

TEMPLE : CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ORDER.

It is eight years now since Dr. William Temple's *Christianity and Social Order* was first published. That was in the Penguin Series, and the paper-covered volume enjoyed a considerable sale, as was to be expected because of the authority of the writer and the challenging nature of the subject. Realizing the importance of the book and that it deserved a more durable binding, the S.C.M. Press have re-issued it at a cost of six shillings. Their enterprise deserves to be supported, for a study of this book is essential to all who value Temple's lasting contribution to Christian thought and action. In its new form it may be brigaded with his other books on this theme, and it will be assured of a still longer life.

Dr. Iremonger, in his biography of Temple, informs us that a hundred and thirty-nine thousand copies of the Penguin were sold, and that Temple in the last two years of his life would have retracted none of the main contentions set forth ' in these seven very important, and highly condensed chapters.' Those who missed the Penguin in the stress of war-time duty may make good their loss now, and they may do so fortified by the knowledge that no less a person than the late Lord Keynes thought that Temple had understated his case for the Church's right to interfere in matters of economics. Keynes also said that in the eighteenth century he could think of no one important in the development of politico-economic

ideas, apart from Bentham, who was not a clergyman and in most cases a high dignitary of the Church.

R. J. Wedderspoon.

THE BEGINNING OF THE GOSPEL.

Believing what one feels is all too true, that 'many people nowadays grow up in ignorance of the facts' of the historical origin of Christianity and its original message to the world, 'and that others, reacting from unintelligent childhood teaching, reject as legendary much that is really well attested,' the Oxford University Press are issuing a Primer of Christianity, part one of which consists of a new translation of Mark, that earliest Gospel, together with a very few passages from other New Testament books, by Professor T. W. Manson—*The Beginning of the Gospel*. It is issued in two editions, one at 6s. 6d., and the other, probably the main one, a school edition at 2s. net. Dr. Manson prefers the sterner reading of the healing of the leper. 'A leper approached him begging his help. Kneeling before him he said, "If you are willing, Sir, you can cleanse me." And moved with wrath he stretched out his hand, touched him and said, "Of course I am willing; be cleansed."' For my part, I hope that that is not the authentic version.

For the rest, there are vivid touches, such as 'He said to the man who had the withered hand, "Stand up where everybody can see you."' Or 'Is it right to pay taxes to the Roman Emperor or not; shall we pay or not? He, seeing their game, said to them, Why do you bring your trick questions to me?' Or, 'So too the chief priests, joking among themselves, with the scribes were saying, "He saved other people, but he can't save himself."' Or, 'But Simon and his companion tracked him down, found him, and told him, "They are all seeking you."' The rebuke to Peter runs, 'Out of my way, Satan! For you are more concerned with human ambitions than with the purposes of God.'

There are introductory chapters upon 'What is Christ?' and 'Who is Christ?' Dr. Manson has set a high standard for himself. Perhaps in these he does not altogether reach it. But one has to remember that school edition. And perhaps he knows best.

A. J. Gossip.

The author of *Freud or Jung* (Allen and Unwin; 15s. net), Dr. Edward Glover, is much annoyed with those who uphold Jung at the expense of Freud, and sometimes the vehemence of his language is hardly consonant with the dignity of the subject-matter. The theories of Freud and Jung are, according to him, incompatible, and those who think they can be reconciled are misled by Jung's habit of expressing his ideas in Freudian terms destitute of Freudian meaning. In any case, eclectics generally speaking are, he says, 'merely a class of unclassifiables, having in common a perhaps excessive disregard for the claims of logical consistence'—a definition which hardly leads us to expect a judicial attitude toward their methods.

There is no doubt whatever on which side of the controversy Dr. Glover stands. He holds that Jung's conception of the Collective Unconscious is comparatively futile, that his interpretation of dreams as prophetic is a confusion of their surface with their latent meaning, that his politics are opportunist, his religion sentimentally orientalized, and his psychology as a whole a regression to the banalities of the old-fashioned *conscious* psychology. But the violence of this attack upon Jung does not convince us that his psychology is wholly perverse, nor, on the other hand, does such an unrelieved criticism of an opponent strengthen the case for Freud or help us to appreciate rightly the latter's great contribution to psychology. We can almost hear him saying, 'Save me from my friends.'

The Apostle Paul, His Life and His Work (Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis; $4.75), written by Olaf Edvard Moe, Th.D., and translated by L. A. Vigness, is a well-printed and well-bound volume. The author is the Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Independent Theological Seminary in Oslo, Norway. He has written two books on the Apostle Paul, the first (that has now appeared in an English translation) dealing with Paul's life and work, the second with his message and doctrine. The translator of the first work is the late Dr. L. A. Vigness, who had completed his task shortly before his death in 1947; he was well known among Lutherans in America.

Olaf Moe's book now translated into English is a reliable, scholarly work, representing the results of Pauline research up to about thirty years ago, and should still be useful to New Testament scholars if only for the bibliographies at the end of each section in which authorities, chiefly German, are cited. But though the structure of the book is laid upon a 'scientific' basis, it is such as can be appreciated by the general reader; and the translator has apparently succeeded in reproducing the author's clear and popular style. We commend the work to those who seek to possess a comprehensive exposition, at once scholarly and conservative, of Paul's life and work from the hand of one who is full of admiration for the Apostle of

the Gentiles, 'the greatest foreign missionary of all time.'

In a well-documented and clearly written study of sixteenth-century ecclesiastical thought—*Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century* (Blackwell; 10s. 6d. net)—the Rev. E. T. Davies tries to follow a *via media* between the High Anglicans who would hold that the Reformation made no difference, and those who contend that the Church of England is a State Church finally established by Queen Elizabeth. The thesis of the book is, briefly, that the Anglican Church is 'a reformed, but not a Reformed, Church.' It is first shown that the writers of the sixteenth century claimed definitely that the Church of England was heir to the Catholic tradition, and that episcopacy, while not necessarily of Divine origin, was so essential to the unity and good ordering of the Church that it might be regarded as part of a fundamental Divine purpose. It preserved the Church in being after the crisis, and the existence of the Church is a proof that episcopacy is in accordance with the will of God. The argument has more than a trace of circularity, but it is well expounded. The assertion of Royal Supremacy, while it exposed the Church to great danger of encroachment on its sphere, is held to have been after all of service to the Church in that it strengthened episcopacy in England over against Geneva on the one hand and Rome on the other. The concluding chapter attempts to show that episcopacy is based on the nature of God's orderly creation, which implies obedience, which, again, implies episcopacy, just as the proper ordering of the State requires monarchy. James the Sixth once said, 'no bishop, no King,' and, in the opinion of the writer of this book, the wisdom of 'the wisest fool in Christendom' was considerable, though others may not agree with this conclusion in respect of the particular point at issue.

Dr. C. H. Dodd has published a series of addresses, *About the Gospels* (Cambridge University Press; 3s. 6d. net), that were originally broadcast in September and October 1949 as part of the Sunday morning services of the British Broadcasting Corporation. The four chapters are entitled The Beginnings of Gospel Writing, The Living Tradition, The Development of Gospel Writing, and The Interpretation of the Gospel. The first deals with Mark and his 'Good News' or 'News of Victory.' The second shows how Mark came to know that the story of Jesus was 'Good News.' The third deals with Matthew and Luke, and the fourth with John. The whole provides for the general reader a masterly approach, terse and vivid, to the Four Gospels, and many should be grateful for it.

Dr. Joseph Dalby has done well to publish the treatise for which Oxford gave him the D.D.

Christian Mysticism and the Natural World (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net) is not a large book—a hundred and forty-seven pages—but it is written by an expert with ample knowledge of his subject. The chapters in it are Mysticism, Grace and Nature, The Necessity of the Supernatural, The Goodness of the Natural, The Mediæval English Mystics, Symbolism and Nature Mysticism, Asceticism and the Via Negativa, The Dark Night and Quietism—for many a right appetizing menu.

There is much loose talk about Mysticism blowing about, but here is accurate information about many things that are vaguely bandied from hand to hand. What is the Dark Night of the Soul, for instance? Our author has a scholarly and many-sided mind, but not the least valuable of his studies is that on that goodly company the Mediæval English mystics, with their characteristic common sense that saved them from many an extreme, and their infectious joy in life and God.

Dr. Dalby has an intense admiration for John of the Cross, who seems to some of us far less human and likeable than, say, Santa Teresa. But it is good for the soul to be brought into the company that meets us in this volume.

Canon Marcus Knight, B.D., moved by the uncertainty as to what has become of their dear ones which, he feels, often faces him at funerals, made up his mind to write a volume that might help such folk. And here it is—*Spiritualism, Reincarnation, and Immortality* (Duckworth; 6s. net). Frankly outlining that puzzledom he finds in many people's minds about such matters, he states the case for Christianity and immortality, and then proceeds to deal with other claimants upon men's belief—reincarnation with its impressive array of adherents down the ages and in the world to-day, psychic research, spiritualism, and the like, which so impress so many in our time. Dealing with such themes writers are apt to become feverish and hectic. But this is a sane and wise and pertinent book, which might well serve its kindly purpose.

'Margaret Harwood's Correspondence' column, now a much appreciated feature in 'The Methodist Recorder,' started in 'The Primitive Methodist Leader' in the nineteen-twenties. The editor of the 'Leader,' the Rev. George Bennett, invited Margaret Harwood (a pseudonym) to write a column for women, and as she is a person of wide sympathies to whom human contacts are easy

she decided it should take the form of a correspondence column in spite of the increased work involved. In 1932, just before the 'Leader' amalgamated with 'The Methodist Times,' the editor asked his readers to decide by vote which feature they liked best. 'Margaret Harwood's Correspondence' headed the list. When later again 'The Methodist Times and Leader' was taken over by 'The Methodist Recorder' the great popularity and usefulness of the column ensured its continuance as a weekly feature. The volume of letters steadily increased and it was found that men were also seeking through it the solution of their pressing problems, social and religious.

Now a selection of the questions and answers has been published by the Epworth Press under the title *Ask Margaret Harwood* (6s. net). It is a delightful and engaging book of infinite variety.

Mr. E. W. F. Tomlin in *The Great Philosophers* (Skeffington; 15s. net) has produced a most readable book, written with clarity but with avoidance of false simplicity. It will help greatly to stimulate interest in the great philosophers of the Western world, and also, it is to be hoped, in their philosophy, for it is the aim of the author 'to survey the course of philosophical thought in relation to the lives of the great philosophers.' He defends himself in advance from the charge of fragmentation by his conception of Western thought as 'one continuous life,' lit up by the adventurousness of speculation. In relation to a book of this kind a reviewer must always ask himself how much it would have meant to him if it had been his first introduction to philosophy, and the reply to such a question would in this case be favourable. The most valuable chapter in the book is the exposition of Aristotle, and amongst modern philosophers Kant fares better than almost any other, although the problem of Hegel is most excellently stated. The treatment of Descartes and his successors and of the British empiricists is disappointingly inadequate, but the concluding chapter on Bergson is both beautiful and illuminating. Logical positivism is severely but justly dealt with in a somewhat sombre epilogue.

The State and School Education 1640–1660 in England and Wales (S.P.C.K.; 11s. 6d. net) is a survey based on printed sources and published for the Church Historical Society by the Rev. W. A. L. Vincent, B.A., B.Litt., Headmaster of Christ Church Cathedral School, Oxford. It is a learned and scholarly piece of work, and is furnished with two appendices, the first containing the names of Grammar Schools which existed in England and Wales in the seventeenth century under the Commonwealth and the second a very useful bibliography containing books on educational facilities, educational writings, State intervention, schools and schoolmasters, not to speak of works contemporary and modern bearing on the subject of the thesis as a whole. The thesis is relevant to modern educational problems as being concerned with the control and support of education by the State, but on this aspect of his thesis Mr. Vincent does not enter into detail.

Is there any consideration that will prevent or overcome the apparent clash between reason and faith in all the various brands of authoritarianism or mysticism which claim to be truer to the facts of life which are expressed in personalism and existentialism and the belief in the direct impact of the Divine word? The Very Rev. W. R. Matthews in his Essex Hall Lecture, *Reason in Religion* (Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d. net), finds it in a refusal to identify reason and reasoning. If the essential function of reason is taken to be synthesis then analysis and logical inference are secondary features. The intuitive insights of morality and art are in some sense rational. Religion and philosophy alike aim at an interpretation of the whole of experience, religion tending towards complete understanding and philosophy towards a culmination in worship. Philosophy, as much as religion, begins with faith, with the acceptance of data. But religion, as Ramsdell has noted, includes in its beginning a value judgment of the special significance of certain aspects of what is given.

Dr. Cecil Roth's latest historical work, *The House of Nasi: Doña Gracia* (Jewish Publication Society of America; $3.00) tells the story of the flight from the Inquisition of a Jewish family in Portugal, and of their final settlement, *via* Antwerp, Lyons, Venice, and Ferrara, in Constantinople, where the Muslim Turks accorded them a hospitality which the West had refused. The leading spirit in the adventure was a remarkable woman, Doña Gracia, aunt of the later famous Duke of Naxos. Immensely wealthy, she was banker, diplomat, philanthropist, defender of her people and promoter of their culture. If, even here, her personality does not stand out very clearly, that is largely because she had to wield her influence by diplomatic means, through her associates and employees in business. But the book gives a striking picture of Europe in the days of the discovery of the East and West Indies, of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, when Islam dominated the Levant. The general history of the period is well enough known to most interested readers. Not so well known is the position of the Jews in it. This volume provides a welcome supplement, besides being of value for its own sake.

Comparative Religion and Evangelism.

By W. S. Urquhart, D.Litt., D.D., D.L., LL.D., Emeritus Principal of the Scottish Church College, Calcutta, and sometime Vice-Chancellor of the University of Calcutta.

A certain tension between knowledge and action, or, more specifically, between a conservative and progressive attitude of mind in the sphere of religion, may be illustrated by the relation of the comparative study of religion to religious propaganda. A detailed study of the various religions may not lead nowadays, as it has been known to do in the past, to the devastating conclusion of the illusoriness of all religion, but it does seem to lead to a diminution of earnestness. Any uncomfortable conflict of loyalties between our devotion to our own religion and our sympathetic consideration of the faiths of other peoples is lessened by a pseudo-scientific assumption of objectivity and by attempts to increase imaginatively our interest in other beliefs. The world is so full of a number of things—religiously—that we should all be as happy as kings — speculatively and practically, living care-free in a lotus-land of satisfied curiosity and aesthetic contemplation, without any twinges of conscience regarding inadequacies and degradations we may have discovered—and passed by. As becomes alert scientists, also, we soothe ourselves, counterbalancingly to these defects, by the slightly doctrinaire discovery of truths of a high order and spiritual quality, which we then proceed to view out of perspective and use as criteria for a favourable judgment on the whole system of which they form a part. If, further, as is frequently the case with students of Comparative Religion, we are also enthusiastic anthropologists, we have probably formulated, and become enamoured of, some theory which we regard as illuminating the whole course of development; and, confusing origin and value, we are specially interested in earlier phases, and resent the counter-valuations of zealous propagandists, protesting that they are spoiling happy hunting grounds and reducing an exciting jungle to an orderly cabbage-patch, full of nutriment no doubt, but exceedingly dull.

And why should we trouble ourselves, it is asked? Why should we put our scientific curiosity in cold storage because of a misguided zeal for improvement? Let us rather leave the religions of the world alone, and they will come home to the promised land, questionable perhaps as to some of their characteristics, but full of amazing and colourful vitality. There may be in them a mixture of degrading evil with uplifting good, but in the ages to come the good will be sorted out from the evil, and who are we to anticipate the discrimination of the centuries? Let us not be like children plucking up a flower because impatient of its slow growth and then throwing it aside to wither or planting it in uncongenial soil. And let us remember also that our judgments, even if adult, may be slightly pharisaic, confusing complacently the victory of truth with the triumph of our particular conception of it.

In any case, it is argued, artificially induced religious change is impossible. We may, if we will, make an anxious-minded distinction between the mere maintenance and the development of religion, but surely development must be left to the higher Powers if such powers there be, and for scientific study there is left only the humbler task of describing as accurately as may be the religions which are at present actually maintained in existence.

The point of view is not new. It may be illustrated from the *Bhagavad-Gita* of two thousand years ago, still the most widely read religious classic in India. In it Krishna describes three types of men whose religion is determined by the proportions in which the three 'moods' or forces of Nature are combined 'Threefold is the faith of embodied men; it results from their own nature. It is of goodness, passion, or dullness' (xvii. 2).

No transference is possible from one class to another; the religion of any can be only the gradual unfolding of the capacities with which the members of the classes are born. Twenty centuries later a popular Indian writer, Swami Vivekānanda, enunciates the same general doctrine. Efforts at transformation of religion are, he thinks, as futile as the attempt to straighten the curl of a dog's tail. They are also unnecessary, for all religions are ultimately the same, and it does not matter which one we temporarily adopt. In any case we have no choice; we must simply obey the dictates of the nature with which we are born, and follow the customs of the caste to which we belong. In view of our further discussion it may, however, be noted in passing that Rudolf Otto, one of the foremost interpreters of the Indian religious situation, refuses to allow that these Indian illustrations represent the full truth of the matter. He joins issue also with Goethe on the general problem, and points out that Goethe over-emphasized the idea of an original unchangeable endowment of which there can be only development and no transformation. 'This view,' says Otto, 'is very one-sided regarding personal human beings who

by education, living influence, action from without upon the soul, and particularly in the religious sphere by "grace" and the "new birth," are capable of transformations which in "the law of the planets" were not foreseen and by that law are not prevented' (*India's Religions of Grace*, 101).

The quotation just given may be taken as a pointer away from the naturalistic and conservative position in the direction of one which alone can make religious propaganda justifiable or even possible, and our problem is How are we to decide between the two opposing points of view? Are we to let the religions of the world alone, or attempt transformation of the lower into the higher, or ultimately the highest conceivable, if there be indeed a 'lower' and a 'higher' or the outlines of an ideal form of religion even faintly discernible?

Much might plausibly be argued in favour of a naturalistic and non-committal attitude towards religious development. Let us accept, it is said, the naturalistic basis, and admit that what exists does exist, and that is all that we can say or do about it. A recent Indian writer goes further than metaphysics and argues that religious propaganda amounts to a misinterpretation of the fundamental logical Law of Contradiction, which really means, not that the Positive and the Negative cannot coexist, but that, if they are opposites, they *must* coexist; otherwise the Positive could not overcome the Negative any more than a pugilist could vanquish an opponent who was not there. Even if we do not breathe easily the air of pure logic, we can reach the same conclusion by remembering the Scriptural injunction about the wheat and the tares growing together until the harvest.

There are other arguments of a less abstract character. Do not, it is said, become too insensitive to the suspicion of Pharisaism, already referred to, which always attaches itself to propaganda. And do not let us be too ready to gloss over the sins associated with past ecclesiastical intrusionism. The Crusades and the Thirty Years' War were not particularly creditable illustrations of organized Christian propaganda, and mass conversions of a more peaceful character have often created more problems than they have seemed to solve. Further, the fundamental Christian virtues of courtesy and tenderness have not always been conspicuously associated with the proclamation of Christianity. Three hundred years ago Milton could describe other religious manifestations as 'Perverse, all-monstrous, abominable, unutterable, or worse,' and not so long ago a prominent theologian could warn his fellow-Christians against 'howling with the wolves' of other religions, and exhort the preacher to valiant proclamation 'without yielding a hairsbreadth to their demons,' —language which is almost an incentive to anti-propagandist vehemence.

But the history of evangelism is not all dark, and propagandists are not all tactless, and in any case the accusation of faults, major or minor, on both sides, does not diminish the seriousness of the problem at issue. The crucial question is, Are we, comprehensively surveying it, as Comparative Religion should enable us to do, satisfied with the religious condition of the world? If we are satisfied, then there is nothing more to be said or done; we may dally comfortably in the dream region of possibilities and contradictions, and assume that the study of other religions has not the slightest connexion with any responsibility of ours regarding them. But if we are *not* satisfied, what then?

However purely scientific and impartial we may pretend to be, we do as a matter of fact and in our heart of hearts, grade religions, not perhaps into the right and the wrong, the good and the bad, but into the better and the worse. And however realistic and objective we may claim to be, we are also incurably idealistic. Whenever we do not flee from religion to 'religions' we find that religion cannot exist unless it is a protest against a calm acceptance of things as they are. Man is never satisfied until he is dead—if even then. Further, it is a vicarious dissatisfaction. We cannot take refuge from it in parochialism. If we have any feeling of the unity of the human race, we cannot absolve ourselves from responsibility for others, the distant as well as the near, for there are really no distant peoples in these days when we are all sitting on each other's doorsteps.

Whether we acknowledge it or not, we are driven into a position to which the medical analogy applies. A doctor who has come into the possession of a precious remedy which he is convinced would bring life to millions, would feel constrained to share it, or would be forced by public opinion to do so. And this would not be Pharisaism on the doctor's part—to recur to a term of abuse of which the opponents of religious propaganda are particularly fond. Doctors may be dogmatic, and very often are; but they are helpers of humanity in need rather than Pharisees.

Is it really necessary that the knowledge of other religions, which Comparative Religion may furnish, should always strengthen the 'no-change' obsession? May it not change sides, as it were, and serve the purposes of diagnosis, and furnish a suggestion of cure. It may point out where in particular lies the inadequacy of a religious faith, or, on the other hand, detect some latent power, not yet developed, perhaps partially atrophied, but yet usable and restorable to health. It may

show, for example, the dangers of mere naturalism, with its frequent incursions of orgiastic tendencies, or, in connexion with philosophical mysticism, suggest that a man ought to be on his guard against the desire to be 'alone with God' in the midst of an environment of clamant social evils which he is doing nothing to remedy. It can speak warningly of conservatism and complacency. It has been said that what Egypt wanted from religion was just 'another Egypt and another Nile,' and Dr. Betty Heimann finds a suggestion of complacency in South Indian temple architecture in the frequent use of straight lines as contrasted with the heaven-pointed arches of Gothic sacred buildings. In the other direction Comparative Religion can help us to discover the promise of better things, aspirations after God and complementary interpretations which have been either overlooked or crushed out in our nearer and more customary religious experience.

More generally and more fundamentally it may be said that we may derive help from the careful study of other forms of faith if Comparative Religion moves from the status of a science to that of a philosophy, the latter being more inclined than the former to go beyond the bounds of the actual and admit the affirmation of the values of ideals. A philosophy of Comparative Religion, if it is to perform its true function, would further liberate itself from the earth-bound tendency of science to regard all facts as upon the same level, or, more specifically, to take the details of religions as all equally valuable, and would claim to exercise discriminating judgment. In short, a philosophy of the type desiderated would approximate more closely to religion itself, defined in a recent book as 'the total response of the whole personality toward that ultimate Reality on which we all depend and which is always acting upon us.'

This brings us to a final point for discussion in this paper. In suggesting the medical analogy it was not denied that doctors even with a valuable remedy might be dogmatic about it. The adherents of a higher religion may run into the same kind of danger, greater in their case because their claims are less easily verified on a matter of fact level. Subjectivity cannot of course be altogether avoided either in the case of the doctor or the religious teacher. Even the doctor has to begin from where he is, with his own discovery, and work outwards with as little arbitrariness as possible. So the religious teacher must begin with his own personal and passionate conviction if he is to begin effectively at all, but he must persistently work out toward the Objective, toward the more and more consciously felt and vocation-creating dominance of the Reality upon which we all depend. Otherwise his testimony will be merely assertorial, and if this is all that it is, it will inevitably and repeatedly be regarded as an impertinent interference with other faiths.

It is here that the crux of the problem lies. The effect of the study of the infinite variety of other religions in creating the notion that religion is illusory is an outmoded sceptical conception. But the tendency, born of much wearying study, to leave the religions of the world alone, is, as we have seen, still very much with us. Yet the sharpness of the opposition to religious evangelistic activity is, we think, chiefly to be explained by the resentment caused through the dogmatism of the propagandist. In the case of the adherents of another religion taken collectively, the resentment is often fanned by the feeling that the dogmatism is a symptom in the higher religion of an imperialistic spirit, this suspicion again resulting in many cases from the historical fact that one of the most prominent of all the higher religions, namely Christianity, has been associated in the minds of those religiously outside of it, with imperial ambitions and control. It has to be remembered that, analogically, in the political sphere, no amount of good government has ever reconciled a less advanced people to the sacrifice of their freedom; they would rather have a bad government of their own than a good government by others. In the individual objector to religious propaganda there has also been a similar stressing of the fundamental claim to liberty of thought and action, arising not only out of the very human dislike of receiving advice but also from the deeper conviction that religion can never be received only as an inheritance or obeyed as an external law; every man must be a law unto himself.

At the same time it is admitted that respect must be given to the ineradicable human tendency toward discrimination, judgment, and the establishment of a pattern. It is impossible that every man should ultimately be a law unto himself. Hence the inescapable demand that if the opinion of one man is to be placed forcibly and convincingly before others, it must be controlled by a vision of a trans-subjective Reality. In other words attempts at religious propaganda can be justified only if the religion of the preacher and would-be convincer is objective as well as subjective. Tension can be resolved only by the constraint of objectivity. Hence it is at this point wholly relevant to remind ourselves that all the great religious leaders of the world, Old Testament prophets, Buddha, Muhammad, and others, have been strongly possessed by this sense of objectivity, have seen a vision of a deeper Reality beyond themselves, and in consequence of this vision have felt the compulsion to share this experience—the good news of the Revelation—with their own people and with

others. Their personal religious experience leads them to protest against things as they are, but their restlessness is cosmic rather than individual, necessitated, not arbitrary or self-imposed. They cannot stay still; they *must* go forth to proclaim their discovery or rather to communicate the revelation which they are sure has been made to them.

Thus if antipathy to religious propaganda is to be lessened or removed, the message to be delivered must not be conceived of as arbitrary, individualist or even as the authoritative imposition of a collective demand, as has so often happened in the history of religion, especially when revelation has been regarded as mainly scriptural or has been confused with venerable credal interpretations of it. We can make a place for an adequate justification of religious propaganda only if we can conceive of revelation as the coming to meet us of the great Reality in which we live and move and have our being.

In our evangelical activity we are not seeking to demand from others a trust in records of a dead past or attempting to impose upon them *our* interpretations of that past, whether scriptural or traditional, but simply asking them, in the spirit of the appeal to the first disciples of Jesus Christ, to 'come and see.' Religious propaganda is possible and justifiable only in so far as we enter into the meaning of the Incarnation and share the belief that God can come into human life, and that, just because He is the creator of their creative spirits, all men have the capacity to receive Him. Jesus Christ Himself is the only complete expression of the missionary spirit because He could say at one and the same time, 'I can of mine own self do nothing,' and 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

In our lesser degrees we human beings have a right to proclaim our religious message only if to some extent we can partake of this spirit, only if the message is not our own, reached impulsively or by balanced statement, but is received through the impact of Reality upon us, received by the gift of God who has created us, given us power to discern the Divine Pattern, and has not left us without guidance in a world into which Jesus Christ has entered.

In view of the tension considered in this paper I cannot but think that too much stress has been laid in Christian circles upon the conception of 'marching orders.' It is very clear-cut and satisfying for immediate action, but it is, taken by itself, a pagan rather than a Christian conception, governmental rather than religious. The sacred command which we have in our minds—'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel'—was not spoken in a void, it was not imposed arbitrarily from above, it was addressed to the brothers of the Son of Man, to those who had become conscious of the Christ in a daily human fellowship which revealed to them the Divine. 'Marching orders,' human nature being what it is, have always left men with the question, implicit or explicit, Why should we obey? and the only satisfactory answer can be that the words are intended to symbolize the continuing constraining purpose of One who convinced His followers that He revealed in fullest measure the fundamental Reality of their lives, and who could through them and others who entered into their succession, help others also to understand—and live. The ultimate justification of religious propaganda is that it is the practical application of the meaning of the Incarnation, the Reality of God coming into reciprocal dynamic relations with the *communicable* convictions of men.

The expert in religious study, who has accumulated much scientific knowledge about the various religions, and is perhaps overwhelmed by it and flattened into inactivity, if he is to come alive again and aware of higher aspects of experience than the merely factual, and stimulated to dissatisfaction with the *status quo*, must be assured that the constraint to evangelism is not arbitrary but necessitated by the cosmic Reality, interpreted by the Incarnation. Then this same expert scientist ceases to be resentful of interference by ignorant, clerically-minded laymen, and becomes himself evangelical just because he has become less dogmatic and more scientific in the broadest and deepest sense of the word.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Parcel of Ground.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'The parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph.'—Jn 4^5.

A few weeks ago I was staying with a friend near Edinburgh. Every time he is up North from London, where he is a medical man, he told me there is one visit he always likes to make. It is to the tiny island of Inchcolm, not far below the Forth Bridge, and a sacred spot in Scottish story. On one occasion when my doctor friend visited it, he took with him two Danish girls who were over here on holiday. One sails from near Leith on the *Forth Lady*, a small steamer, till one gets ashore on Inchcolm. It is, as I said, a very small island, but trim and well-kept, with the old abbey and several small sandy bays. After he and his friends had had a picnic lunch at one of these bays, one of the Danish ladies did a strange thing. She took out a paper bag and started filling it up with sand. Naturally he asked her why she did so. She said that she was taking it to some friends in Denmark, who specially wanted it. Their name, she said, was Ogilwy, or, as we would say, Ogilvie. Their people generations before had gone over from here, a fact of which they were very proud, feeling that in a measure they still belonged to Scotland.

Another incident now, not unlike that story about the little paper bag of sand from Inchcolm, took place in the life of a famous man. Most of you will have heard of Chopin, that favourite composer, and some of you possibly have played something of his lovely music, like the 'Minute Waltz,' as it is often styled. Chopin's father was French, his mother a Polish aristocrat, and he, Frédéric François, was born and brought up in Poland. Chopin had a very happy childhood and was a prodigy, a marvel, as a pianist. Poor Poland, however, was eventually invaded by the Russians and Chopin left it, never to return. At a function when he was leaving he was presented with something unusual, a silver goblet of Polish earth. A friend, handing it to him, said: 'May you never forget your native land wherever you go: may you never cease to love it with a warm and faithful heart.' And, though he was never able to go back, wherever and whenever he played, he had that silver goblet set up on the piano before him.

Now these two stories bring us back to our text, 'the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph,' that sacred piece of earth in which Joseph's body, brought home from faraway Egypt, was finally buried. Nearly all men and nations have got holy places, or some such ground which is dear and sacred to them. You may know some lines of Kipling which perfectly describe what we may feel:

> God gave all men earth to love,
> But since our hearts are small,
> Ordained for each one spot should prove
> Belovèd over all.

Yes, it's natural, isn't it, for us to love 'one spot' in particular, 'the parcel of ground' where we grow up. Only likewise, surely, to love the land in which it is. Shakespeare, remember, said that so well for Englishmen:

> This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England.

While Sir Walter Scott said it equally well for all who are Scots:

> Breathes there a man, with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land.

Let us all then love our native land. Let us be determined, too, to make it such that it will always be a land worth loving and cherishing, a fair land, a free land, and, not least of all, a Christian land.

Showing Your Colours.

By the Reverend W. Challenor, Tottington, Bury.

'Even so let your light shine before men. . . .'—Mt 5^{16} (R.V.).

Have you seen a robin lately? I'm sure you have, and perhaps you have wondered why he has a red breast. If you have, you are by no means the first person to ask that question. People have been asking it for ages, and now and again they have told stories to explain it all. One of the loveliest of these stories is that of a little brown bird who happened to be flying by when Jesus hung on the Cross. It was so sorry for the Saviour in His pain that it perched itself on the top of the Cross and began to tug at the crown of thorns which the soldiers had placed on the head of Jesus. But those cruel thorns were

too stout for that little beak, and in the struggle a very sharp thorn pierced the breast of the little brown bird, and from that day to this, says the story, the robin bears a red stain on its breast.

I have just been reading another story about the robin redbreast written, this time, by a bird-lover who watched robins on his lawn for a great number of years. It is the robin's true life-story, and every word of it fascinated me. Here are one or two exciting facts I learned about the robin.

In the first place the robin loves to have his own *territory*. When he comes to live in a district he has a very good look round and at last picks out a corner of a field or wood, or an area of the garden. From that time onward he is king of the castle in that territory, and woe betide any other robin who tries to intrude! Other birds do not matter, but other robins are strictly prohibited! But how does he manage to keep them out? Does he fight them? Only on very rare occasions, says the naturalist. This is what happens. If an intruder flies in the owner begins to *sing*, softly at first, then louder and louder as he gets nearer to the trespasser, then he throws back his head and sings with all his might. Often, that proves too much for the visitor and off he flies in a great hurry. He has been warned!

But if the song fails to drive him away the owner tries something else. He puffs out his red breast and looks as fierce as he possibly can. If the intruder is above him he leans back; if he is below him he bends forward. The idea seems to be to show as much red as possible. And that often does the trick, off goes the outsider, thoroughly scared, and the owner is left in peace. I expect he struts about and feels mighty pleased with himself, for he has won a bloodless victory—just by *showing his colours*!

Strangely enough, the very next book I read, a very different kind of story, told of a similar incident. The writer, a famous explorer, tells how he was once trekking in the Tibetan mountains with a band of coolies when they suddenly began to revolt. They drew their knives and came to his tent and began to threaten the solitary white man. The explorer went to the tent door, and the moment he did so most of the coolies ran away! The few that were left were most respectful, and the matter was settled peacefully. The white man wondered afterwards why it had been so easy, then he remembered that he had been wearing a *red* sweater at the time, and the sight of his red breast had been too much for the would-be rebels! He, too, had won a victory just by showing his colours!

So you see, God did a very wonderful thing when He gave the robin a red breast. He gave him the means of defending his territory by peaceful and very effective means.

Like the robin we have our territories. God has given us our *lives* and He wants us to guard them from the things that are always trying to intrude—things like lies, uncleanness, and hatred—things which tempt us to make the wrong use of God's precious gifts. Paul called our bodies 'temples'—places where God longs to dwell, and that surely means lives that are clean and useful. We must see to it then that we guard our 'temples' well, and the most effective way of doing that is, as Jesus said, by letting our light shine out—or to put it another way, by showing our true colours—our purity and our love—so that the ugly things which try to break in will slouch away, knowing that there is no room for them in that particular territory.

Prayer for a Special Mission.

O Christ, our Living Lord,
who wast seen of above five hundred brethren at once,
into all our assemblies,
where the Spirit and the bride say, Come,
come Thou in Thy risen power;
and let every one that is athirst come
and take the water of life freely.
As good tidings of great joy
which shall be to all people,
let the grace and glory of Thy promises
put an end to misery and fear.

Grant O God to those who proclaim the gospel
full assurance of faith,
a wondering gratitude for Thy mercy,
a passionate sense of debt to Christ,
so that they may truly speak of what they know.

May all who co-operate in the mission
by their presence, their offerings, their prayers,
by organizing and visitation and other help,
have every Christian grace of character,
friendliness and sincerity and willingness to serve,
so that their diligence and brotherly love
may bear witness to their Lord.
O Spirit of God,
plead Thou with those we seek to reach.
Awaken the love of virtue
in the careless and the hardened.
Revive hope in those burdened with guilt,
or feeling helpless amid temptations.
Make such as consider only earthly goods
grow aware of eternal values and realities.
Move men without faith in any future,
without belief in any victory of good,
to take regard of Jesus,
and through Him to believe in God.

Lead men to receive Him as their Teacher;
to look to Him as their Example;
to see Him bearing our sins on the Cross;
to read in His victory over death
the promise of life everlasting.
So may the work of this mission
bring salvation to men
to the praise and glory of Thy name, O God,
through Jesus Christ, our Lord. AMEN.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Pardon, Peace, and a Quiet Mind.

BY THE REVEREND W. H. MURRAY WALTON, M.A.,
VICAR OF BROMLEY, KENT.

'My peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you.'—Jn 14^{27}.

The Collect for the Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity, coming down to us, as it does, from the fifth century, is one that Christendom has made its own. The phrases 'to thy faithful people pardon and peace' and 'serve thee with a quiet mind' have become part of the very language of prayer, not only to those who use liturgical forms but to all Christians. At a time therefore when international tensions are acute, when despite six years of Labour Government industrial relations leave much to be desired, and when the ever-mounting divorce statistics suggest that peace is ceasing to be synonymous with home, it may be not altogether out of place to think again about the lessons of this Collect. Indeed, the very conditions of human life to-day call out loudly that we should do so. The eastern entrance to the Inland Sea of Japan is a narrow channel through which the waters of the Pacific Ocean rush in or out with the ebb and flow of the tide, lashed into great waves or revolving rapidly in roaring whirlpools. Long years ago a poet, looking on this scene from a rocky promontory, composed one of those thirty-one syllable poems for which Japan is famous. Translated it runs as follows:

> 'At last I have heard that the whirlpool of Awa is a calm without wind compared to human life.'

If it were true then, how much more so to-day! To the Collect then!

'Pardon and peace'—the two are far more closely related than we care to think. This is due in part to the fact that in human relations, where the connexion would seem obvious, pride so often steps in and side-tracks us from asking the pardon we need, and the consequence is that all the good effect that could flow from the asking is lost. 'Why should I ask his pardon, when he was wrong in the first instance? It is much more a case for him to ask mine.' Quite true, may be; yet what results might not spring from my taking the initiative because I recognize that I may not be wholly right, and he may not be completely wrong. Once admit such a possibility and the first step towards healing the breach has been taken. For if I am not wholly right, whatever I may hope to get from him, there is obviously one step which can be taken—and that is mine. Simply saying that I am sorry may produce surprising results. In 1932 I was one of the 'visitors' at the S.C.M. Quadrennial in Edinburgh. It was a time when the relations between China and Japan were about as bad as they could be. Some of us who felt keenly on the situation, and who knew that there were faults on both sides, invited the delegates from the two nations to meet us at tea. We began to wonder whether we had not made a mistake after all, so tense was the atmosphere. Then suddenly the leading Japanese representative rose to his feet (he was a man who occupied a high position in the League Secretariat at Geneva) and in a few broken sentences apologised to his Chinese friends for what his countrymen were doing in Manchuria. Only those of us who knew Japan realized what it must have cost him to do so. But the effect was instantaneous. Immediately a Chinese delegate replied in a similar strain, and before we separated we had knelt together in humble prayer that God would forgive the sins of our respective nations, and bind us together once again. In that moving play, *The Good Road*, we get a similar picture of tensions, this time in the family circle, and with the same result as the husband asks his wife's forgiveness, and the wife that of her husband. Pardon and peace—in human relations the two are inseparable.

But the problem before the world to-day is not primarily that of *human* relationships; it is more fundamental. It is the relation of man to his God. And the tragedy of it all is that man does not realize this, and in consequence casts about in this direction and in that in his efforts to achieve peace, and in vain. For until a man is right with God he is never really going to get right with man. The Divine factor is essential to any solution. But what has the forgiveness of God, it is asked, to do with friendship across the Iron Curtain or in relations between capital and labour, or with peace in the home? When the peace of God comes into my heart as a result of the Divine pardon, in the first place I get a new vision of what relationships can be, and from this comes the incentive to take the first step, the difficult first step, in the restoration of human relations by seeking pardon from my neighbour. The hardness of the Communist philosophy leaves us hopeless and helpless;

we shall never counteract its appeal by economic and other material means. But Communism lacks something which Christianity possesses, and that something is an essential element in man's make up—love. Love is of God and of Him alone. It is 'the only way,' as Dr. Kagawa has said, 'therefore Christ will win, because there is no love like Christ's.' When therefore there comes into my heart the peace which follows God's forgiveness, and when I realize the love outpoured to enable me to enjoy this experience, there comes to me also a passionate desire to let all others into the secret; and so the first step is taken, at personal cost maybe, to get relations put right. But though 'love' in the words of Dr. Quick 'is the greatest tutor of an ultimate optimism about the world,' it will not quickly triumph. There are great barriers of suspicion which have to be torn down, but the end is sure. For years after the First World War relations between Japan and China were kept poisoned by the militarist party in Japan. Then a new Government came into power, perhaps the most enlightened Japan has ever known, which was not afraid to stand up to the military leaders. The new Foreign Minister, a man imbued with strong Christian ideals, made it clear that new principles, henceforth, so far as his own country was concerned, were going to govern its attitude to its great neighbour. For the first year of office every advance he made was rebuffed—'was it some new militarist trick'? But he persevered, till gradually China began to realize that a new power was in control. There is little doubt that in the end he would have succeeded, had it not been that his chief was assassinated by a tool of the military clique, and the bad old days came back.

In the joy of his new experience Saul Kane in Masefield's poem *The Everlasting Mercy* is filled with a desire

To brother all the souls on earth.

Restored relationships provide a new incentive to service. But inasmuch as this restoration is something which has taken place in the deeps of man's soul, the service resulting is not of that flamboyant character which doubtless gives much satisfaction to the donor but evokes a rather doubtful response on the part of the recipient. Rather it is of that quiet purposeful kind which shuns self-advertisement and is far more concerned with the welfare of the one in need than with any expression of gratitude which the action may call forth. And when we come to think of it, this service of a quiet mind in the end is the service which counts.

It was my privilege when first ordained to serve under a vicar who was a well-known preacher and teacher and in great demand at gatherings all over the country. In addition he was minister to a large congregation and vicar of a parish humming with activity. The claims that were made on his time must have been enormous. And yet if I went to seek his help or advice—and my experience was that of countless others—the impression I got was here is a man with time for me, a man who wants to help me and who will allow nothing to come in the way to prevent his doing so; and help me he did. I owe him a debt I can never repay. Despite the pressure of life his service was of that quiet kind which brings peace and strength to all who are touched by it. Has it ever struck us that this was one of the most striking features of our Lord's service? As we read the Gospels with their stories of the multitudes pressing in on Him all the time, everywhere, till He could scarcely call His life His own, and His only time for communion with His Father was late into the night or in the early morning, we never find any suggestion of hurry or bustle; the work He did was carried through with a serenity and calm which sprang from a deep sense of the peace of God. Had He not something which we have lost?

And so this Sunday, as we offer the Collect for the day, let us make its prayer our own. As we do so we shall find that not only will our service for the Master be more effective than it has been hitherto, but also that the peace which follows the pardon He has given will lift us into the presence of the One who gave it, and we shall discover indeed that it is a 'peace different from anything the world can give.'

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Remembrance Sunday.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'Alas for heroes fallen low.'—2 S 1^{27} (Moffatt).

Imagine men speaking of another war already! Only five short years since the last conflict ended, and now the world re-arming fast, and responsible statesmen talking as if a fresh outbreak of hostilities is inevitable! It is little wonder that many feel that the past two world holocausts have been utterly in vain, and that gratitude to God for anything achieved by Him, through our beloved dead, this Remembrance Day is hypocrisy. They are one with the cynical Wynnant in C. E. Montague's *Rough Justice*, who, when speaking of Bron and Molly Garth, says, 'They've won the war and scored nothing by it but losses.' Or, if you turn to the text, they feel, like David after Saul's bid to stem the aggression of the Philistines, that the sacrifice of so much noble blood was so useless that he could only cry, 'Alas, for heroes

fallen low.' This temper which is abroad to-day, that the past two wars have been fought utterly in vain, is having a most serious effect. On the one hand it is causing suffering of a new kind to those who lost loved ones in the struggles. The heart-break they experienced when the sad news was announced to them was mild to the anguish of soul they are enduring in the belief that their awful loss has been of no account. Had something palpable been gained by the wars it would not have been so bad, but to have nothing apparent accrue from them is enough to drive such sufferers to diabolical cynicism. And, on the other hand, the sense that our past struggles have been rewarded with nothing is making many wonder if Communism should be resisted. What point is there in opposing this pernicious creed with force, if challenged to do so, when to wage war twice over has brought no result whatever? Would it not be highest sense to submit tamely to it without striking a blow? What a difference it would make to legions of people in our day if they had the insight to see, through Christianity, that this conclusion they have come to is wrong. The last two wars have not been fought in vain. Despite superficial appearances two great things were achieved by them.

1. First, in both instances, tyranny was checked, which is a tremendous accomplishment. It is curious how at this time of day men believe that should they take up the cudgels against any particular evil they can bludgeon it out of existence if they have a mind to do so. With its profound insight into evil, Christianity declares this is a fallacy utter and complete. When we rise against any evil and appear to eliminate it, our victory is only partial or temporary. No evil is ever completely overcome. Like a weed after rain it springs into life again out of nowhere. Men speak of slavery having been abolished, but if it does not exist in the form of black men having to work in plantations as chattels for white, can anyone look at countries dominated by Russia in Europe or at the industrial world and say that slavery is gone? It still exists in another form, just as every heresy that the Church has fought and condemned has reappeared in new trappings. This was the fact Jesus divulged in the Parable of the Empty House. When the bad tenant was cast out, that was not the end of him. He still lived, and when opportunity afforded he reappeared and entered into possession again. That is how it stands with tyranny. Decent men wish to see it blotted out of the earth, and many of them in their innocence imagine that it can be. Christianity warns us that it cannot. It keeps alive, and constantly recurs in different forms no matter how we do battle against it. All that can be done with tyranny, as with any other evil, is to keep it in check. This is what the men who fought both wars did. They never abolished tyranny, as we know to our cost, but they did what can be done to it, namely, kept it at bay; and to do that with tyranny is a far greater achievement than many imagine. When Pastor Niemöller was in this country recently, he told how when first put into a Concentration Camp he was condemned to solitary confinement. He was allowed nothing to read, he was exercised alone, and was not allowed to have conversation with his guard. After three years of such torture the Camp commandant was changed and the new official asked Niemöller if there was anything he particularly requested. The Pastor solicited a Bible to read, and, mercifully, this was granted. When he heard his fellow prisoners being exercised in the yard he leapt to his cell window and began reading his New Testament aloud. As each prisoner passed, he caught some word of God which steadied his faltering courage and strengthened him to endure. To have Nazi tyranny relaxed just a fraction, so as to allow a Bible to be put into that Camp, meant literally the difference between life and a living death for its occupants. Men may deride the keeping at bay of tyranny as being of little moment, but the fact is that this is what allows freedom and decency in any degree whatever to exist. To do the only thing one can with tyranny, check it and prevent it engulfing the world completely, is the difference between life and a living death to us men. And it was just such a work that was achieved by the men who fought for us.

2. The other thing that was achieved by both wars was that the values realized by men through these conflicts have not been lost. If the drama of the Crucifixion and Resurrection means anything, it is that the miracle of miracles which God can work is the bringing forth of good out of evil, just as by proper use of midden refuse a farmer can make the land yield bumper crops. War is evil. Christianity has no part with those who glorify it and attempt to make it out as good. Yet, out of this gigantic evil, as with all others, God can wring good; and this He has done through the last two wars. He made some of the finest Christian values to be realized by us men as never before in history. When the Bishop of Bristol saw the behaviour of the people of that city when it was being devastated from the air, he cried, 'If this be original sin, give me more of it.' It was not simply the men in the Forces, it was the ordinary people at home who, through the terror they had to endure, found all barriers go down and fellowship that was unique spring up between them; self-interest was driven out

in the most extraordinary fashion as each sought to succour and save his neighbour; lust for material things went for many as if of no importance. It was values such as these that God made men to experience through the past two wars as never to the same degree in history. Ah, but have these not all been lost? Toward the end of the last war J. B. Priestley, who had often spoken to this nation and heartened it in its darkest hours, came to the microphone and told us how he had been at a theatre show where a girl had tripped on to the stage, clad in male evening attire, and sang a ditty about going to get 'lit up' when the lights go up in London. Priestley said he was frankly perturbed. He maintained that at Dunkirk, and during the Battle of Britain, this country rose to its greatest heights yet. At that time noble Christian values had been realized among us as never before in our history, but when peace came were they going to be cast away, and were we merely going to get lit up? Many would claim Priestley's fear has been realized. The Christian values recognized during the strife have all perished already. So it appears to the eyes of many; but not to Christians who know their extraordinary faith. To them, with their Christian view of history, all these precious values tasted by us in war-time, and apparently now gone, are not in Tennyson's phrase 'cast as rubbish to the void.' They know that when the Kingdom of God is fulfilled at the end of time there is no value which man has realized in his struggles in history which shall not find a place in that Kingdom. This is the other great achievement of both wars. The Christian values men were made to experience through these conflicts are not lost. They are preserved and await us in the Kingdom of God.

Ruskin declares that a much rarer gift than the fine one of having ability to think is that of being able to see. It was this delicate power Jesus had to the highest degree. He had the gift which Renan calls, 'the gift of seeing underground.' He could see possibilities in outcasts and harlots when others could see none. He could see evidence of the love of God in a sparrow lying on the ground, frozen to death with cold, when others saw only senseless cruelty. He could see a means of saving the world by going to a Cross when His own friends thought it was the height of madness. It is through this penetrating insight of Jesus into the nature of evil and the Kingdom of God that we can see how the last two wars were not fought in vain. They did not accomplish what men hoped for. Wars never do. But they secured more profound things which only Christian eyes can see. This is the knowledge which can comfort those who lost loved ones, in the sense of making them strong, and can fortify us to withstand the new tyranny which threatens us even now.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Three Greatest Words in Scripture.

BY THE REVEREND A. W. M'CLYMONT, D.LITT., EDINBURGH.

'He that loveth not knoweth not God; for *God is love . . . God is love*; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.'—1 Jn $4^{8.\ 16}$.

I do not know if you will agree with me that these are the three greatest words in the Bible. They are certainly very simple in so far as they consist of two letters, three letters, four letters, and thus might have their place in the first reading book of a little child. But they have also about them an air of sublimity, like a great mountain that stands out monopolizing the horizon, dominating the sky, with much variety and splendour so that as we approach it the single ridge is broken into peaks and cliffs where life has a thousand homes for bird and beast. Or we might say these words might be set as the motto on the first page of the world's finest book of wisdom telling us of the beginning and the end of man's seeking.

But perhaps I like to think of these words along the line of what science has made terribly clear to us, that immense power may be shut up within very little bulk. Many years ago I used to live in a mining area in Lanarkshire and at night we used to be troubled by noises, especially a soft thud which to our domesticated ears sounded as if a child had fallen out of bed. Nothing of the kind had happened, and we discovered that below the manse miners were at work on the night shift, stripping the roof and making the roads for the men who on the morrow were to win the coal. And what were they using for this ripping and roaring that disturbed our slumbers? Just a little stick of gelignite. How much more tremendous is the power contained in these little words of our text! Set in the hearts of men, how they would blast down the barriers of selfishness and hate, dispel our ignorance, and cleanse our thoughts and lives!

Let us look a little more closely at the words of our text and consider some of the wisdom they may bring us.

First of all with regard to *Belief and Worship*. Now one of the questions that man has addressed to himself and the universe is just, What am I to believe concerning God? What is God? And to this we may answer, Have we not our Creeds, The Confession of Faith, and The Shorter Catechism? Let us not disparage their value, their noble and sonorous language. 'God is a Spirit

infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, in his being wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth' (Question 4). These are indeed magnificent words, and yet of course lacking in that very element which is obvious and intelligible to learned and unlearned alike—'God is Love.' If at any time we weary of the Creeds or the definitions of the Church, may we not go quietly back to this simplest of all creeds? At any rate let us begin there and in the end we shall probably find ourselves back at where we started.

Such a belief as this will certainly affect our thought of *Worship*. Going to church is no longer a pleasant and healthful custom, a convention that steadies the moral structure of society or gives us friendly intercourse with our fellows. It is a royal invitation and more. It is a rendezvous with One who cares for us with a supreme interest, to whom we may give our confidence and from whom we may receive healing and power. Nowhere else than in the Church and at our worship will it be made known in word and fact that God is Love, no, not in the world of Nature, not in the newspapers and in the history of man, but only in the Church, where the fact of Christ is set forth in the design of God for us men and for our salvation. With such a thought of worship in our hearts our worship can never be languid or conventional. It becomes warm and alive.

Or again, our text has a bearing upon our ordinary tasks and everyday life, upon our *Work*. It is a common complaint that we have lost the old spirit of work, its ideals of thoroughness and integrity, its sense of honour, yes, and the spirit of joyfulness when all things are done as in the great Taskmaster's eye. There is some truth in this complaint, though it would be wrong to overlook the vast amount of honest effort that is put into production of materials necessary for our existence.

But the words of our text have changed the outlook upon work for many. Some of you may know a little book called *The Letters of Brother Lawrence*. He was cook in a monastery in Paris about 1660 and he found the domestic duties assigned to him very irksome. He was not very clever with his fingers and there were incidents such as happen in all kitchens—broken dishes and hot tempers—and he felt all this was most unseemly. The remedy for long evaded him until at last he resolved that he would do all things for the love of God. Then the worry and the fretting, the arguments, the censures began to disappear. Peace had returned to himself and to those about him through the love of God.

Love is indeed one of the incentives not usually included in the calculations of the industrialists and lawmakers, but the Old Testament has its story of Jacob and Rachel and how Jacob toiled that he might win his bride and build his home. The seven years, we read, 'seemed unto him but a few days, for the love he had to her.' Is not the same story to be told of many a young couple who toil on because they look forward to the day when their toil will be rewarded by a roof of their own.

From this domestic scene we can get a new understanding of *Duty* not as drudgery but as devotion. As we have a share in God's love, so are we partners in the Father's business. The spirit of selfishness is gone; with the windows thrown open to the heavens the atmosphere is fresher and the effort less laborious. In the marketplace in Blairgowrie upon a fountain there is this inscription: 'Not with eye-service as men-pleasers'—surely a happy reminder of the true spirit of business.

There will always be tasks that are heavy and conditions that are onerous but can we not keep in touch with a power that can make us more considerate one of another, less anxious of material gain, more desirous of doing loyally the will of our Father in heaven?

It is inevitable also in the light of our text that a sure place should be given to *the individual* over against the State. Amid the closer organization of life, it is the individual organism that is the basic fact. Christianity puts the emphasis upon each soul. As Paul said, He 'loved me and gave himself for me.' The child of fear is stunted and weak; the child of love is wholesome and lively. Character can grow and blossom when the assurance is given that even behind the clouds the sun's warmth is not denied.

Even when the shadow falls upon each life at the end love is stronger than death and a clue is given to that mystery which we wait to see unveiled in the mansions prepared for us.

Is it thought our discussion has been on lines too sentimental? Have we forgotten *the shame of sin and tragedy*? I do not think our text passes them by or makes light of them. You recall the Shorter Catechism and its definition of sin—'Sin is any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God.' But sin is far more than the breaking of laws: it is the breaking of hearts, for it is an offence not so much of the law of God as the love of God, not a matter of law courts but of broken homes. Here is a poignant illustration of my meaning. One of the saddest utterances I have ever heard was the cry of a broken man, 'She was once all in the world to me, and now she is less than nothing.'

Jesus answers for us two great questions about two great facts in life—*What is God?* and *What is Love?* Some have said God is just a force that drives through all things, a spirit of life manifesting

itself in many forms and at many stages. And others have said love is just a pretty toy, a trifle or a bubble, a will o' the wisp, or in darker mood a terror, an instinct of the jungle hot and fiery which no man can tame or quench. Jesus has delivered us from two horrors, a loveless God and a godless love. He has joined together the First and the Second Commandment, to love the Lord our God and our neighbour as ourself. Because He has shown us the Father, He has opened to us a new and living way. If there be any who find the words of our text insufficient amid all the perplexities of life, then let us set them in the midst of the Christian story and recall how it is also written, 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.'

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Is Church Like a Theatre?

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., GLASGOW.

'They that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.'—Jn 4^{24}.

At a glance there is some similarity between a church and a theatre or concert hall. It is a common feature that a crowd of people are gathered to watch and listen. In most services there is some music and ceremony. At Roman Catholic High Mass in a cathedral there is a large company of clergy and assistants in colourful vestments, with movement timed and placed as precisely and elaborately as in an opera. So people may unconsciously carry ideas and attitudes from one kind of assembly to the other. A minister may think of his congregation as an audience. A congregation may regard an eloquent preacher as a 'star turn.' This sort of confusion is illustrated in the old story of a reporter who described a prayer as 'the finest ever offered up to a Boston congregation.'

Such reflections may occur idly and be entertained flippantly or even profanely. But also to work out the comparison that may be made between church and theatre may be a quite serious and simple and helpful way of clearing up ideas about worship and correcting mistaken attitudes in worship. A hundred years ago Kierkegaard, a Danish minister with a powerful but gloomy mind who was constantly denouncing the hypocrisy which he detected in the churches of his country, made the comparison in a way that has often been quoted since.

He says that many people, feeling the church to be rather like a theatre, regard a congregation as an audience. It listens and appreciates the music, and the voice and gestures of the preacher, and the words of the prayers, and the ideas of the sermon, as an audience judges a cast and a play. Of course this was said long before Kierkegaard. Ezekiel seems to have been a popular preacher. This is his bitter description of his congregation. 'Thy people talk of thee . . . saying, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord . . . and they sit before thee as my people. . . . And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument; for they hear thy words, but they do them not.' On this view the minister's position is like that of an actor on the stage. The weight of the service rests on him. He has to hold his hearers. And as for God, He may be in the background somewhere, like the author who has written the play; but He is not noticed.

Kierkegaard goes on to urge that the comparison of church and theatre has something true in it if only it is made along a different line. Earnest worshippers are not an audience. They are rather the players on the stage. It is their thoughts, their acts of devotion, their vows of obedience, their response to God's word that constitute the performance. And like actors who do not perfectly know their lines and the cues they need a prompter. This is the minister's part. He does not give the performance. He is like the producer or prompter hidden in the wings, sustaining the actors where they might falter or fail. Or, one might say, the worshippers are like an orchestra. It is they who make the music. The minister is just the conductor who calls them to action, and directs the speed and balance. And God? In a church it is God who is the audience. It is before Him and to Him that the play, if for a moment one calls the worship a play, is presented. Worship is not listening to a minister or a choir. It is an energetic uplifting of heart and soul to God; a going down to the depths of shame and sorrow; a rising again in joy at the wonder of forgiveness; an obedient hearing of the Divine Word; a making of vows of obedience; an embracing of lofty aspirations. Every member of a congregation has his part in this spiritual exercise. God alone is the judge of how far the service has been reality or formality, a success or a failure. God is the audience.

In this connexion certain words in the Fourth Gospel have a bearing. 'They that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.' 'Truth' here, as so often in John, means reality, genuineness; as in such a phrase as 'that man is in truth a hero.' The words do not mean 'in spirit with a right creed.' They mean 'in spirit and in reality.' The requirement is not that worshippers must be orthodox but that they must be sincere.

We believe that we please God when we obey His call and gather for His worship, but we cannot believe that it is possible to impress Him by any mere form or ceremony. 'God is not mocked.' 'All things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do.' Yet worship has always been liable to be made something of an outward show. There is, for example, an element of pretentiousness in bringing into operation the whole elaborate and expensive organization appropriate for a large public gathering if it is known that only two or three of the public will attend the service. The impressive setting may indeed be an aid to devotion but the danger is not far away of thinking that the perpetuation of a traditional usage in this empty fashion is in itself honouring to God. True worship must be in spirit and in reality. It is as needful to entreat religious people to be sincere as to entreat careless people to be religious.

Because God is holy and we are sinful, worship must include penitence. The prophet Ezra said that when he thought of his guilt he blushed. Before God a genuine worshipper will feel sorry and ashamed as he thinks of his way of life, so unlike Christ's. Yet how often we join quite placidly in a confession of all kinds of wickedness. And worship must include what we call aspiration; some desire to rise above what we have been and come nearer to God and to the fulfilling His purpose in our lives. But it is easy to join in words that express desires for love and purity and unselfishness without really contemplating any programme of amendment, and while fully intending to do some low thing again. One of the sad memories that haunted Saint Augustine was that in his wanton youth he had prayed 'Lord, give me purity, but not now.' Reflecting thus, another pious soul made this petition, 'Chiefly, Lord, forgive our prayers.'

Most churches to-day are making efforts to secure the real and active participation of the whole congregation in worship. One finds shorter, simpler prayers in plain modern speech, the use of Amens and responses, uniting in the Lord's Prayer, making the offering as part of the service instead of at the door. Here and there people object to such things if they are different from old custom, and call them ritualistic innovations. More general is the recognition that their intention is to be realistic, that is to say, to make every one realize his share in the activity of worship. Here is the proper criterion of any form of service. Any ritual is harmful as far as it tends to make worship a formality. Any plan is good as far as it tends to make people and more people take a real share in the worship.

There is thus something worth thinking over in the comparison between theatre and church. When a man comes to church he is as it were going on to a stage; and even more than an actor he may well be nervous. Will he play his part rightly? The minister, like a prompter, is there to help him. And God is the audience. 'They that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in reality.' The one serious question is how God will judge the worship. 'Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts. . . . Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean. . . . Cast me not away from thy presence. . . . O Lord, open thou my lips; and my mouth shall shew forth thy praise.'

Love and Righteousness.

A Study of the Influence of Christianity on Language.

By the Reverend E. Kenneth Lee, M.A., M.Litt., Vicar of Lofthouse, near Wakefield.

Because Christianity revealed a new life it required a fresh vocabulary to express the new conditions. Words, therefore, came into use which were, in some cases, absolutely new inventions, in others so charged with new meaning as to be equivalent to new words.

The most obvious example is the word ἀγάπη. There is no sure evidence of its use in the extant classical Greek authors. 'There are only three supposed instances of its use in "profane" Greek, two of which are now read otherwise and the third is doubtful.'[1] It is used in the LXX and may possibly have been a vernacular word long before it took its place in literature. Its use in the LXX is however, widely different from its use in the New Testament. In the LXX ἀγάπη is used in a sense identical with ἔρως, a word absolutely excluded from the New Testament and employed in two passages only in the LXX—Pr 7^{18} and 30^{16}. In the latter of these two passages there is a clear

[1] Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, 2.

mistranslation, ἔρως γυναικός, where Aquila and Symmachus render more correctly ἐποχὴ μήτρας, *Aq.*; συναχὴ μήτρος, *Sym.* In this sense of ἔρως, or the passion of love, ἀγάπη occurs in 2 S 13[15], Jer 2[2], and frequently in the Song of Songs; in Ec 9[1. 6] the sense is neutral. This must not be taken to imply that the idea of Divine love is absent from the Old Testament. It was love (*'ahabah*) that moved God to elect Israel for His own people. And the establishment of the Covenant and the giving of the Law was an expression of His love (*chesed*).[1] But this love was limited to the righteous, to those who were faithful to His Covenant (cf. Dt 6[6-10]). This is very different from the New Testament conception of the Divine Love drawing near to publicans and sinners in the Person of our Lord. 'For such a love has no place within a legal scheme; and to those who think in terms of law and merited reward the thought of it must be blasphemy.'[2]

There were two reasons why the writers of the New Testament could not use ἔρως to convey the depth of the Christian idea of love. It was, of course, steeped with the very worst associations of pagan life. But the philosophical associations would also have conveyed an erroneous idea of the nature of God. According to Plato love is the movement of man towards ever higher things; there is no thought of God loving man. The gods have all and need nothing: they can therefore only be the object of love. Love as an active desire belongs exclusively to man, for love is essentially the desire of the lower for the higher (cf. *Symposium*, 211 b). The same conception is to be found in Aristotle. He, however, extends the idea to the movement of the whole universe. The means by which the world is set in motion is the desire of the lower for the higher, κινεῖ ὡς ἐρώμενον (*Met.* Λ 7, 1072 b). The loved object sets in motion him who loves it by the attraction which it exercises. Thus the whole universe has love for its motive force. Each lower thing strives towards that which is higher, and seeks to become like it. But, as in Plato, such love cannot be ascribed to God. The object of God's thought must be the best of all possible objects. God cannot, therefore, have an object of thought outside Himself. He is therefore defined by Aristotle as 'Thought of Thought' (νόησις νοήσεως, *Met.* Λ 9, 1074 b, 33–35). It is in harmony with this conception that he affirms that God cannot return our love, because personal intercourse with Him is out of the question (*Magna Moralia*, 1208 b, 26–32).

The theological notion, therefore, implied by the word ἔρως conveys the idea that God cannot love men; for such love would imply a downward movement from the level of Divine perfection to a lower level.[3] It was perhaps this pagan conception of God's nature that prompted John to say, 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins' (1 Jn 4[10]). This conception of love was the direct result of the Incarnation: 'God so loved the world, that he gave . . .' (Jn 3[16]). These two different theological conceptions meant that Christians could not possibly use the word ἔρως without misrepresenting the distinctive idea of love. The only alternative was to take the rare word ἀγάπη and fill it with a Christian meaning. A comparatively colourless word thus came to express the highest Christian grace, the bond of the Christian society, the fulfilment of the new law which Christ established, and the essence of the Divine nature (1 Jn 4[8]).[4] Stauffer brings out the rich content which the word ἀγάπη came to possess in Christian thought in the following series of contrasts with ἔρως. 'The word ἔρως is from the beginning an undiscriminating love, which seeks its satisfaction now here, now there. Ἀγάπη is a love which selects its object and cleaves to it. Ἔρως is determined by a more or less undefined impulse towards an object. Ἀγάπη is determined from the side of the subject—it is a free purposeful act. Ἔρως is used, in its highest sense, of the upward striving of humanity, ἄγαπη of love for the Divine. Ἀγαπᾶν is chiefly applied to the love of God, the love of the higher which lifts up the lower, and exalts it above others. Ἔρως seeks in another the satisfaction of its own hunger for life, ἀγαπᾶν must often be translated "to show charity towards"; it is an active, giving love, which seeks the good of its object.'[5]

This enrichment of the word ἀγάπη as a result of a new conception of the nature of God is well known. Another great Biblical word which reveals a similar development is δικαιοσύνη. Although it is not like ἀγάπη the creation of Christianity, it is a word of momentous importance. Its roots go deep into the religious consciousness of mankind. The word δικαιοσύνη does not occur in the Greek poets, but with Homer justice (δίκη) is 'the everlasting attribute of Zeus.' In Pindar the righteous are the special care of the gods (*Nem.* x. 54); and justice is beautifully described as 'sister of peace,' and both are 'golden children of wise Themis' (*Ol.*, xiii. 7). 'The unwritten laws of Divine justice

[1] See N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, 133.

[2] Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, i. 49.

[3] Cf. Nygren, *op. cit.*, 165 ff.

[4] 'In its redemption from use as a mere successor to the archaic ἔρως, Alexandrian Jews of the first century B.C. seem to have led the way' (Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, 2).

[5] *Theol. Wörterbuch*, i. 37; cf. Nygren, *op. cit.*, 165.

are more ancient than the law of living princes, and transcends them,' says Antigone (*Soph. Antig.*, 454); and Euripides speaks of justice as 'stronger than injustice' (*Ion.*, 1117). The conception rises to a still higher level in the Platonic and Aristotelian systems. The story of Er, the son of Armenius, with which the *Republic* closes, sets out better than by formal definition the Platonic view of 'righteousness.' With Aristotle justice is 'the starting point of right action and of right desire'; it is 'the sum of all other excellencies'; it is 'more beautiful than the morning and evening star.' It differs from perfect virtue only in a way which makes it superior to virtue; for it is the *use* of virtue. A man cannot be righteous to himself alone. It is goodness that imparts itself (κοινωνικὴ ἀρετή, *Pol.* III., xiii. 3). With such a history and such an alliance of noble thoughts the Hellenic δικαιοσύνη had gifts to impart to Judaism as well as gifts to receive. The knowledge of all that δικαιοσύνη meant and connoted would incline the Hellenic proselyte to view with favour a religion which was based on righteousness.

In the Old Testament righteousness is not by any means an abstract attribute of God. Righteousness is doing good. But this ethical outlook of the prophets did not mean that their ideas on good conduct sprang from what we would now call humanitarian principles. Their insistence on right conduct was religious in origin. The standards of conduct which they set before the people were derived from their insight into the nature of God. Hence in the prophets the righteousness of God is conceived as being projected, as it were, from the Divine Being and realized among men.[1] Although the prophets protested against the identification of righteousness with ritual observances, the word suffered a deterioration in meaning similar to that of ἀγάπη.[2] Both words came to denote 'almsgiving.' As almsgiving was the obvious outcome of brotherly love, so it came to be regarded with the Jews as the highest act of righteousness.[3] Familiar evidence of this will be found in the variant reading of Mt 6^{1}, where, in place of the true reading δικαιοσύνην is found, in the less authoritative MSS, ἐλεημοσύνην, a word inserted in all probability as a marginal gloss to explain δικαιοσύνην. Jerome has, '*Justitiam hoc est eleemosynam.*' Compare also the parallelism in Ps 112^{9}: 'He hath dispersed, he hath given to the needy; his righteousness endureth for ever.' And in Dn 4^{27}: 'Break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor.'

It was the office of Christianity to give to δικαιοσύνη a deeper and more profound meaning. The 'righteousness' of the New Testament goes back to the prophets,[4] but enlarges its scope as the result of the new knowledge of God revealed by Jesus. Three points may be selected to illustrate the way in which the idea of righteousness was developed through Christianity.

1. The gradual revelation of a Divine righteousness in the Gospel accounts for the power of the gospel and for its effectiveness for salvation. The gospel is a force working for salvation *because* righteousness is revealed in it. This great truth is expressed in Ro 1^{17}. In this passage righteousness is regarded as inherent in God and imparted to man. Its condition and starting point is faith, and in the process of revelation faith grows and deepens (ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν). This Divine righteousness, then, is revealed or manifested in the life of a human soul, and in the movements of the world and of society. It is for a Christian the key to history, and the explanation of the deepest mystery of our faith, the atonement through Jesus Christ: 'whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness' (Ro 3^{25}).

2. The important phrase, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ (Ro 3^{26}), emphasizes and explains δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ. It teaches that the righteousness of God is the cause of man's righteousness. To use logical expressions, it is the formal, efficient and final cause of man's righteousness. For Divine and human righteousness are one and the same thing, and human righteousness springs from, and is always aiming at, Divine righteousness. This is a purely Christian truth, and rests upon the mystery of the Incarnation. The expression itself, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα, does not mean 'in order that he should be just and *yet* the justifier'—there is no concessive force in the participle—but 'that he should be just and the justifier,' righteous and the giver of righteousness. As to δικαιοῦν, we take it to mean 'to reckon righteous.' In Ro 4^{5}, Paul gives a definition which seems to put this sense beyond doubt: 'But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness.' His teaching on this point is that the ungodly are reckoned or treated by God as righteous, because He reckons as their righteousness the faith which has Christ, especially His death on Calvary, as its object, and which grows to such union with Christ as to become a being crucified and risen with Him. Doubtless this is

[1] Cf. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans* (*I.C.C.*), 35.

[2] Moulton and Milligan quote two Christian papyri in which the word is reduced to the meaning 'charity'—P Gen $1^{14, 7}$ (iv.–v. A.D.) and P. Lond 77. 58 (viii. A.D.).

[3] See N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, 77 f.

[4] See Snaith, *op. cit.*, 161 ff.

the beginning of salvation, but it is a momentous beginning, which one, who, like Paul, had tried to reach salvation by the legal method was not likely to undervalue. No wonder he appropriated to it the title, the righteousness of God, as if it were the principle thing or even everything. This does not mean that he undervalues what follows. It means that he has a due sense of the infinite importance of being at last on the right road.

3. A third accession of meaning which righteousness has received through the Christian revelation is concerned with the meaning and results of it as an attribute of God in Christ Jesus. As such righteousness is the source and ground of the forgiveness of sins. This truth is expressed in 1 Jn 1[9]: ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τας ἁμαρτίας, καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας. The use of the particle ἵνα with adjective and nouns is characteristic of John's style (cf. 1 Jn 3[11] 4[21]). In these and other passages ἵνα expresses both purpose or aim, and result. For in the Hebrew thought where Divine action is concerned, aim and result are identified. The teaching, then, of the above passage is that the faithfulness (πίστις) and righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) of God have for the aim and result remission of sins and cleansing from all unrighteousness on the condition of confession of sins. Here δικαιοσύνη combines in an ascending scale the Greek, Jewish and Christian use of the word. It contains the original Greek sense of due appointment, the Hebrew sense of the Divine character of righteousness tending to mercy and forgiveness, and the extended Christian sense of forgiveness through Jesus Christ, who is essentially δίκαιος, the 'Righteous One.' Cf. 1 Jn 2[1]: παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τον πατέρα, Ἰησουν Χριστὸν δίκαιον where the adjective is not a simple epithet, but indicates that characteristic of our Lord which gives efficacy to His office of Advocate.

This brief study of the influence of Christianity upon two key words of the New Testament shows how important it is that we should be aware of the system of thought which lies behind the use of words. That is one reason, of course, why words whose profound meaning is familiar to the close reader of the Bible often convey a very different meaning to many of our contemporaries whose philosophy of life has radically changed their meaning.

Contributions and Comments.

The Evidence for the Belief that our Lord Himself Claimed to be Divine.

May I add a short note to the useful article upon this subject in The Expository Times for May, 1950? I would call attention to the somewhat neglected sections, Mt 8[1-4] 9[1-8], Mk 1[40]–2[12], Lk 5[12-26]. Christ answers the leper simply, 'I will: be thou made clean.' Then He tells the paralytic, 'Thy sins are forgiven.' The scribes object (at all events in their minds) that Christ is blaspheming: who can forgive sins save God alone? This last question is not in Matthew. Christ does not deny that God alone can do so, but proves by the miracle that He Himself has the power. Apart from the exception just noted, the essential words of the incident are in all three synoptic Gospels.

C. Lattey.

Heythrop College, Oxon.

Entre Nous.

Micah vi. 8.

That devout Roman Catholic lady, Monica Baldwin, in her brilliant and amusing book, *I Leap over the Wall*, tells how after twenty-eight years as a nun she emerged at the age of forty-nine into a changed world. Her description of conventual life is respectful and sympathetic, though ultimately she became convinced she had not a true vocation to it. In one place she gives the philosophical theory underlying the dedication of the Order to which she belonged to the recitation of the Divine Office in choir.

'God . . . created man *principally* in order to be adored by him. . . . But the nothingness of the creature would make his adoration of the infinite entirely valueless. . . . (Nevertheless) the worship offered by those who are truly incorporated with God-made-man would have (infinite) value . . . which is what happens in the Mass. A Catholic who uses liturgical prayer . . . provided always that he is in a state of grace . . . prays officially as a member of the mystical body of Christ, a worship adequate to the infinite.'

Here is an idea of God and His purpose curiously abstracted from any interest in everyday human

life. It all seems remote from the prophet's question, ' What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God ? '

Songs of Self and God.

It sometimes happens that books of poems by men who were not recognized poets have in them a very special interest. It is true that such a book is a parergon, but it is also true that it is in a man's relaxation and amusement that we often learn most about the man. Such books are specially interesting when they come from the mind and the pen of those who were theologians because then we have still another demonstration that often the heart has reasons of which the mind knows nothing. Such a book is *Songs of Self and God* (James Clarke ; 7s. 6d. net), by that notable scholar and preacher, the late Rev. Arthur Temple Cadoux, B.A., D.D.

In one sense it is true to say that here is more of Dr. Cadoux's mind and heart than in any other book he ever wrote. Dr. Cadoux's theology was by no means conservative ; yet here in this book, over and over again, there sounds the note of personal encounter with Jesus Christ and intimate faith.

I lived on borrowings of belief ;
  Only the arguments were mine,—
An unremunerative brief,
  And hard, defending the divine.

Then Jesus stood before my mind ;
  I was arrested, held by Him ;
And in astonishment I found
  Belief in God no longer dim.

The faith I delicately held
  In forceps of an argument
Became an energy that felled
  My enervating discontent.

Or again,

Books had I read, and had been taught
  Old arguments ; long had I pored
Upon theology, and thought
  I knew, and knew that I was bored.

Neatly defined, my creed lay still,
  Like a prescription in a drawer,
Unquestioned and unused, my ill
  Not being the trouble it was for.

Then on life's highway, far ahead
  I saw Him. . . .

It is an uplifting thing to see at the back of that questing mind this personal encounter with Christ which silenced all arguments.

But along with that personal encounter there went a mind that had to be satisfied.

Give me a sceptic faith, a mind
  To think and think until I find.

Or again,

Persistent doubters soon shall sing
  Of all that they believe,
For doubt's one sort of questioning,
  And they that ask, receive.

There is a definite hymn-like quality about some of the poems.

Here, where the world's dull riot
  No more blockades the ear,
In liberty and quiet,
  We apprehend Thee near.

Thou every barrier breakest
  That shames Thy generous sun ;
And by the same love makest
  Us with ourselves at one.

Just sometimes there emerges a real lyrical quality and a real economy of words, as in the short piece ' The Heavens Declare.'

In the sunset's flare, the heavens declare
  I know not what :
Mine eyes I lift where the hill mists drift,
  And they help me not.
For gold I sought in the mines of thought,
  But the grains were few ;
Then the life that smiled in a little Child
Its full word spoke in a heart that broke,
  And I knew.

It would be easy to criticise this volume. Dr. Cadoux was too fond of the short-lined quatrain with a double rhyme and the result is a certain monotony. But there is here much to linger in the memory and much to kindle the flame of devotion, for here we are in the inner room of the heart of a man who combined the search of indefatigable thought with the fire of intimate love.

There is a brief but useful Foreword to the book by Mr. Idris W. Phillips.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.